

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES

VOL. XLIII

No. 7

JULY 1958

THE SIMPLIFICATION OF THE RUBRICS OF 1955

THE decree *Cum nostra* of 23 March 1955 (= D.G.R.S.) brought a most welcome simplification of the rubrics of the Roman Breviary and Missal, but it also gave birth to a new series of problems regarding its interpretation. To attempt to solve some of these problems it is necessary to give some account of the official decisions of S.R.C. since the publication of the decree on points arising from it. S.R.C. has, it seems, been bombarded by perplexed rubricians—especially those who have the formidable task of preparing *Ordos*—with a number of queries, and has replied to a very large number of them with unusual promptitude.¹ One set of replies (2.6.55) appeared in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* of 1955 (p. 418), and this, with part of another set—the queries² submitted by Fr Pizzoni, C.M., Director of the Pontifical Liturgical Academy (Rome)—was reproduced in the *Ordo* for the Universal Church (= U.O.) for 1957 and 1958. Queries were sent by some dioceses of France: Bayonne (17.10.55),³ Rodez (19.11.55), Valence (31.10.55); by the Benedictines of England (16.6.56), France (11.7.56), S Paul's, Rome (15.11.56) and Belgium (15.4.57). From the Fathers of the Holy Ghost came questions (18.6.56) and from the Capuchins of Angers (20.2.57). The replies of S.R.C., given privately, have fortunately been published in liturgical reviews: in the very authoritative *Ephemerides Liturgicae* of Rome (whose director and two of whose editorial staff are consultants of S.R.C.), *L'Ami du Clergé*, *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales*, *Paroisse et Liturgie*. From these replies it is possible to deduce certain principles and rules which govern the order

¹ Not all the replies are quite clear, and it is no small task to collate them and conciliate them with one another. A number of points remain to be cleared up, and only tentative replies can be given at present to some difficulties about the number and order of prayers in the Mass.

² The reply to these is dated 3.11.1955.

³ The dates are those of the replies of S.R.C.

and number of prayers at Mass and other difficulties that arise from *D.G.R.S.*, Title III, §§1-4.

In a Mass, besides the prayer of the Mass (and any prayers united to it under one conclusion) there may occur any of the following classes of prayers:

(1) Commemorations in the strict sense—the remembrance of a Sunday, feast or feria occurring in both Mass and the Office—and these of two kinds: (a) imperative commemorations “which may never be omitted and have absolute precedence” (*D.G.R.S.* III, 2 where they are listed), and (b) ordinary commemorations. This is the meaning of the word “commemoration” in *D.G.R.S.*, III, §§2 and 4, but in §3 it has a wider meaning,¹ and includes also occasional prayers, *collectae imperatae* and votive prayers.

(2) occasional prayers,² i.e. the prayer for the Pope or Bishop on certain anniversaries, and the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament.

(3) *collectae imperatae* which are, normally, of two classes *pro re gravi* and *non pro re gravi* or *simpliciter imperatae*.³

(4) votive (optional) prayers, a peculiar one being the prayer for the celebrant himself on the anniversary of his ordination, which is *sui generis* being votive *per se*, but specially privileged. The general rule about the number of prayers in any Mass is that all those prescribed or allowed are subject to the rule of three (*D.G.R.S.*, III, 3) and some to the restrictions imposed by the rite of the Mass (*D.G.R.S.*, III, 4). Which prayers are selected—out of many claimants—and the order in which they are said is governed by rules of precedence.

ORDER OF PRECEDENCE OF PRAYERS

The normal precedence of prayers is as follows:

(1) the prayer of the Mass, with any prayer that may have to be said under one conclusion with it;

¹ Cf. *S.R.C.*, 20.2.57; 15.4.57, ad 7, and *Ephemerides* (=E.L.)¹, '56 (p. 265).

² These are sometimes included among the “prayers prescribed by the rubrics” (cf. *S.R.C.*, 16.6.56, ad 6a) in contrast to *imperatae* or votive prayers.

³ Throughout this reply an *imperata* means one *pro re gravi* unless otherwise stated.

(2) inseparable commemorations¹ (i.e. prayers of St Peter and St Paul);

(3) imperative commemorations (those never omitted—*D.R.G.S.*, §III, 2; the order of precedence among these is that given in this list);²

(4) occasional prayers—the order of precedence among these is (a) prayer for the Pope or Bishop, (b) prayer of the Blessed Sacrament at the altar of exposition, the two former prayers being more proper than the latter in any particular case;³

(5)⁴ *Collectae imperatae pro re gravi* whenever, if placed after an ordinary commemoration (which is their normal place—*Additiones Missalis*, VI, 4), they would be excluded by *D.G.R.S.*, §3;

(6) ordinary occurring commemorations;

(7) *collectae imperatae pro re non gravi*;

(8) votive prayers.

PLACE OF PRAYERS

According to the rubrics before the simplification of 1955 and at present (unless where modified by the 1955 legislation) the place of extra prayers is this:

(1) For the occasional prayers:

(a) that for the Pope or Bishop is to be: "in the last place after the prayers prescribed by the rubrics" (*Additiones Missalis*, II, 5), and so before a prayer prescribed by the Bishop (*oratio imperata*);

(b) that for the Blessed Sacrament prayer: after imperative commemorations, before prayers prescribed by the rubrics [i.e. ordinary commemorations] and *imperatae* (*U.O.* 1958, p. xxix; *S.R.C.*, II, 128 and II).

(2) For *imperatae* (whether *pro re gravi* or not) "in the last place after prayers prescribed by the rubrics" (*Addit.*, VI, 4;

¹ Cf. *S.R.C.*, 17.10.55, ad 24.

² *S.R.C.*, 11.7.56, ad 3.

³ Cf. *E.L.*, 1957, p. 57.

⁴ Cf. *S.R.C.*, 20.2.57, ad 1; 15.4.57, ad 7.

U.O. 1958, p. xli). The "last place" in both cases seems to be in regard to strict commemorations. Among themselves (as explained below) the prayer for the Pope or Bishop comes before that of the Blessed Sacrament, while both come before an *imperata* (even *pro re gravi*).

(3) For the ordination anniversary prayer: after the prayers prescribed by the rubrics (*Addit.*, VI, 3).

THE RULE OF THREE

The rule (*D.R.G.S.*, III, 3) that other commemorations (besides imperative ones) which may occur are admitted provided that the total number of prayers does not exceed three means that in reckoning the number three, imperative commemorations are to be included (*S.R.C.*, 2.6.55, ad 4; 11.7.56, ad 1).

The rule of three is a rigid rule applying not only to strict commemorations but to every class of prayer (*S.R.C.*, 17.10.55, ad 3; 20.2.57). It would apply even to an imperative commemoration did several of these occur¹ (an unlikely case); and it applies within the octave of Christmas, (*S.R.C.* 17.10.55, ad 12), despite the apparent exception suggested by *D.G.R.S.*, §II, 13. The rule of three is not, however, applicable to inseparable commemorations² (the two prayers count as one); nor to a prayer said under one conclusion with the prayer of the Mass³ with which it coalesces.

OCCASIONAL PRAYERS

(i) These replace ordinary commemorations if this be necessary to observe the rule of three (Cf. *S.R.C.*, 15.4.57, ad 2).

(ii) They may be added in the Mass despite the rule of *D.G.R.S.*, §4a, e.g. this year the anniversary of the election of the Pope (2 March) fell on the second Sunday of Lent (a

¹ *E.L.*, 1955, p. 375; 1956, p. 267.

² *S.R.C.*, 17.10.55, ad 24.

³ *S.R.C.*, 18.6.56, ad 13. Cf. O'Connell, "Simplifying the Rubrics", p. 44.

double of the first class), yet the prayer for him was said (*U.O in loco*);¹ or despite §4 b, thus if an imperative commemoration (e.g. that of a Lenten feria) occurs on a double of the second class an occasional prayer may yet be added.² And in a sung Mass, despite *D.G.R.S.*, III, §4a—provided the day is not a Sunday or feast of the first class, Ash Wednesday, a privileged vigil, or within the octave of Easter or Pentecost—an occasional prayer may be added.³ In other words the restrictions on commemorations in III, 4, are, apparently, concerned with ordinary occurring commemorations (in the strict sense), and not with commemorations in the wide sense.

(iii) These occasional prayers take precedence of *collectae imperatae*,⁴ because they are more proper on any particular occasion.

(iv) Among themselves the prayer for the Pope or Bishop,⁵ which occurs only a limited number of times in the year, takes precedence of the Blessed Sacrament prayer.

PRAYER OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

(i) This is now added only at Mass celebrated at the altar of Exposition.⁶

(ii) It follows any imperative commemoration, or a prayer for the Pope or Bishop (since these are more proper), but precedes a *collecta imperata pro re gravi* and ordinary commemorations; and both of these yield place to it if a prayer has to be omitted because of the rule of *D.G.R.S.*, III, 3.

(iii) It is added even on the most solemn feasts of the Universal Church (*S.R.C.*, 27.4.1927; 11.1.1928), despite *D.G.R.S.*, III, 4 a, to which it is not subject.

¹ Perhaps the prayer for the Pope enjoys the status of an imperative commemoration.

² *S.R.C.*, 15.4.57, ad 7.

³ *S.R.C.*, 15.4.57, ad 1.

⁴ *S.R.C.*, 15.4.57, ad 7; cf. 20.2.57, ad 1.

⁵ If this be impeded by a Sunday or feast of the first class, or by a privileged feria or vigil, it is transferred to the first free day (*S.R.C.*, 18.6.56, ad 16).

⁶ *S.R.C.*, 2.6.55, ad 9.

COLLECTAE IMPERATAE

(i) A *collecta imperata pro re gravi* is not omitted during the octaves of Easter, Pentecost (on days which are not doubles of the first class) and Christmas.¹

(ii) It comes after occasional prayers, and so if, e.g. on a double of the second class occurs an imperative commemoration or the prayer for the Pope or Bishop and an *imperata*, this latter is omitted.²

(iii) If it occurs in a Mass with two (ordinary) commemorations it replaces the second of these³ to observe the rule of three.

NUMBER OF PRAYERS

If a number of prayers happen to occur, so that the total exceeds three, or the rules of *D.G.R.S.*, III, §4 have to be applied, which prayer is to be dropped? To determine this the general order of precedence (given above) must be considered, and also the particular order of precedence among the prayers in question (the less proper yielding place to the more proper on the particular occasion).⁴ Accordingly, a prayer for the Bishop on the anniversary of his consecration would take precedence of the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament and of any *imperata*.

ORDINATION ANNIVERSARY PRAYER

(i) This is a votive prayer but privileged.

(ii) It comes after all prayers prescribed by the rubrics (*Additiones*, VI, 3).

(iii) An *imperata (pro re gravi)* takes precedence of it.

¹ *U.O.*

² *S.R.C.*, 15.4.57, ad 7. This decision apparently reverses one given 3.11.55, ad 19, and 16.6.56, ad 6.

³ *U.O.*, 1958 (p. xli).

⁴ Cf. *S.R.C.*, 17.10.55, ad 3; *E.L.*, 1957, p. 57.

THE SIMPLIFICATION OF THE RUBRICS 391

(iv) It is certainly subject to *D.G.R.S.*, III, §3 (the rule of three); but it is disputed as to whether it is subject to the rules of *D.G.R.S.*, III, §4 (a) (for a sung Mass) or 4 (b) and (c).

(v) If impeded because the ordination anniversary falls on a double of the first class, during Holy Week, or on the vigil of Christmas or Pentecost, the prayer is transferable to the nearest subsequent day not similarly impeded.¹ If excluded for another reason, e.g. by the rule of three, it is not certain if it is then transferable.²

VOTIVE PRAYERS

(i) If a prayer for the dead be chosen to be added in a non-Requiem Mass,³ it need no longer be said in the penultimate place, but may be in the last place.⁴

(ii) In a low votive Requiem Mass three prayers may be said and the celebrant may choose the three he wishes from the prayers for the dead. There is no longer an obligation to include the prayer *Fidelium* for all the faithful departed, but it is becoming so to remember all the Holy Souls in accordance with the Church's practice. The new rubric (*D.G.R.S.*, V, 2) allows three prayers to be said in this low votive Requiem Mass, but may only two be said in all? *S.R.C.*, 15.11.56, ad V, seems to allow this, while a reply of 18.6.56, ad 18a, had forbidden it.

CASES

To illustrate the principles which, apparently, apply at present to the choice and order of prayers here is a selection of cases:

1. (a) ordinary Sunday (or double 2 cl.),
(b) two (ordinary) commemorations,

¹ Cf. *Addit.*, vi, 3.

² *U.O.*, 1958 (p. xlii), is silent on this point.

³ *Addit.*, vi, 6.

⁴ *S.R.C.*, 18.6.56, ad 18; 15.11.56, ad 6.

- (c) *imperata*,¹
omit second commemoration, *G.D.R.S.*, III, 4 b.²
2. (a) ordinary Sunday (or double 2 cl.),
(b) ordinary commemoration,
(c) occasional prayer,
(d) *imperata*,
omit (b), *D.G.R.S.*, III, 3.
3. (a) ordinary double,
(b) imperative commemoration (e.g. a Lenten feria),
(c) ordinary commemoration,
(d) occasional prayer or *imperata*,
omit (c), *D.G.R.S.*, III, 3.
4. (a) ordinary Sunday (or double 2 cl.),
(b) occasional prayer,
(c) *imperata*,
say all three (*D.G.R.S.*, III, 4 b does not apply to (b) or (c)).
5. (a) double,
(b) imperative commemoration,
(c) prayer for Pope or Bishop,
(d) prayer of Blessed Sacrament,
omit (d)—*D.G.R.S.*, III, 3; (c) is more proper in this case and remains.
6. (a) double 2 class,
(b) imperative commemoration,
(c) prayer of Blessed Sacrament,
(d) *imperata*,
omit (d), *D.G.R.S.*, III, 3.

When extensive changes are made in complicated rubrics as happened in the decree *Cum nostra* of 1955, considerable time must elapse before the principles on which the changes are based become clear to those not engaged in the preparation of such a decree, and an almost unlimited number of questions are likely to arise about the application of the new law to individual cases. *S.R.C.* has seen fit to solve a number of these questions with authority; the answers to others, unless also

¹ By *imperata* in each case is meant one *pro re gravi*.

² This case occurred this year in England and Wales on 4 May.

given by S.R.C., must—and will in due time—be worked out by those called “approved authors”. Meantime attempts at solving them must be regarded as experimental and provisional and so, naturally, open to controversy.

J. B. O’CONNELL

BABYLONIAN PARALLELS AND SCRIPTURAL ACROBATICS

(SOME THOUGHTS ON GENESIS I–XI)

THERE is a psalm which runs:

How long will my enemies cast sneering looks at me?
How long will they plot treachery and evil against me? . . .
I am tossed about like the waves in a storm
My heart takes flight, it flies like a bird of heaven
Night and day I moan like a dove, weep bitter tears of sadness
My days are spent in shadow, my months in darkness, my years
in shame
Death and distress have made an end of me. . . .

How long wilt thou be angry and turn thy face from me?
How long will thy wrath burn and thy soul be angry against me?
Turn thy head towards him whom thou hast rejected
Turn thy face and speak a word of grace. . . .
Let my prayer and supplication come unto thee
Let thy great mercies come upon me
That those who see me may magnify thy name
And I, from earth, will glorify thy divinity and power.

Anyone who is at all familiar with the Old Testament could be excused for imagining that he recognizes this extract: it has the idiom and style common to so many of those prayers—the moving description of distress, the outspoken imagery, the anguished cry for help, even the final note of confidence that the appeal has been heard. But if he wished to identify it, he

would need to search for a long time. It is, in fact, not to be found in the Psalter nor anywhere else in the Old Testament. It is a pagan psalm, addressed to the Babylonian goddess Ishtar.

It is not difficult to multiply examples of this kind. When Hammurabi's Code was discovered at the beginning of this century, headlines were made by the fact that many of his laws were identical with those which, five hundred years later, the Israelites accepted from the hand of Moses as the written Word of God. There is a Babylonian "Penitential Psalm" that could in parts be mistaken for an extract from the book of Job. The Assyrian Coronation Hymns, which see the king's enthronement as his investiture with divine power and sonship, and which commission him to rule in his god's name and dispense his justice, will remind the reader irresistibly of those royal psalms to which we have sometimes too unequivocally attached the title "messianic".¹ The great Saturday Creation Psalm (Ps. 103) is in parts a direct echo of Akhenaten's famous Hymn to Aton, composed centuries earlier while the Israelites were still in Egypt; and some sections of the book of Proverbs were similarly been found to have striking affinities with the ninth-century teachings of the Egyptian sage Amen-em-Ope. Nor are these parallels confined to the Old Testament. The Dead Sea Scrolls have only partially been deciphered, and it would be foolish to imagine that we have yet heard the last of them; but even at this stage it is clear that they offer numerous analogies with the New Testament, especially with the preaching of John the Baptist and with the concept of Christianity that is presented by the Fourth Gospel.

It is of course possible to exaggerate these analogies. There are writers who have gained much popularity (if not scholarly reputation) by emphasizing all the points on which the doctrine and practices of the Qumran community make some contact with Christianity, and conveniently omitting all mention of the

¹ This does not of course mean that these psalms (Pss. 2, 44, 71, 109, for instance) have no reference to Christ; he is their ultimate fulfilment as he is the fulfilment of all the themes the Old Testament traces. But many of them have a prior reference to actual Israelite kings, and even those which look to the indefinite messianic future are expressed in terms of what the Israelites expected their own kings to be. It is quite misleading to say (as many text books do) that the hopes expressed in these psalms will fit no one but Christ.

differences. Nevertheless the truth is not served by exaggerating in the opposite direction and pretending that these points of contact do not exist. All the dissimilarities in the world will not obscure the fact that the whole terminology of the Qumran community and even more its spirituality link it very closely with the New Testament. Here was the religion of the Prophets lived at the deepest level, in the humility and poverty of spirit which longed for a New Covenant. And it was precisely to such a faithful remnant, conscious of the fact that official Judaism had missed the mark, that Christianity made its appeal. Qumran can no more be dissociated from the New Testament than can the Old Testament. It was in just such human yearning and hope that God incarnated his revelation and prepared for Christ. To speak of the "uniqueness" or "originality" of Christianity does not involve the absurdity of imagining that it was born in a vacuum.

This article is not concerned with the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹ They are mentioned merely as a recent example of the sort of parallelism that scholars have long pointed out between the Bible and non-biblical literature. Our concern here is with that particular form of parallelism which has been given the name of "Bible and Babel", the term Babel being used to cover the vast amount of ancient Mesopotamian literature which has been unearthed and deciphered this century, and of which the *Epic of Gilgamesh* and the seven "creation" tablets of the *Enuma Elish* have become the most famous, and the word Bible referring primarily to the first eleven chapters of Genesis, where the resemblance with Babel is most marked, although, as has been indicated above, similar contacts can be established with other biblical books.

As long as Gen. i-xi stood alone, as long as there was no other ancient eastern literature to which it could be compared, it was natural enough to speak of it as something unique. The assumption was, however, severely shaken by this discovery of a literature which seemed to be so closely allied to it in time and

¹ A short, clear and balanced explanation of their relationship with the New Testament may be found in two articles by Fr Alex Jones in *Scripture*, July 1956 and January 1957.

place and thought. Indeed the conclusion immediately drawn by many who could see only the similarities was that Genesis was no more than a Hebrew adaptation of these Babylonian myths and legends. Others in reaction concentrated so much on the differences between the two that any similarities had to be ascribed to the common origin of Bible and Babel in a hastily invented "primitive tradition". Both approaches were wrong because both, either out of enthusiasm or out of panic, seized on only one element of the truth that lies in the just balance between the two.

Genesis i-iii cannot in fact be properly understood without reference to the Babylonian accounts of the origin of the world and of mankind. The differences between the two are indeed striking, and no one who has made even a superficial comparison between them can possibly be unaware of the fact. The Babylonian pantheon of gods, with their bickering, mutual jealousy and all-too-human foibles, have given way in the Bible to a God who is alone, infinitely remote and eternal. A world made up of deified elements locked in everlasting struggle with each other has here been ordered into an inventory of all created things, ruled over and blessed by the God who created them with an effortless word from his mouth. The Babylonian man, the plaything of chance who can yet outwit the gods by his astuteness and cunning, stands in violent contrast with the biblical man, the crown of God's creation and his intimate friend, who can yet bring disaster on himself by his free choice. The whole atmosphere of the Bible is different from that of Babel, and anyone who can fail to remark on it is either a knave or a fool.

Yet we cannot escape the fact that this profoundly different thought is expressed within the framework of the same language, the same imagery and the same concepts. In Babel, as well as in Bible, the original chaos is conquered by light, and the original deep is divided into two to provide the waters above and below the earth. The *Enuma Elish*, like Genesis, presents man as the climax of the work of creation, produced with deliberation as the image of his creator, a paradoxical combination of the earthly and the divine. *Gilgamesh*, like Genesis, tells of the

search for an immortality which is jealously guarded by the gods and of which man is eventually cheated by a serpent; and if its symbolism stops short at the "tree of life", one does not have to search far to find the rest. The "garden" where animals live at peace with each other and where sickness and old age are unknown, the "tree of knowledge" guarded by the "cherubim" and the divine "thunderbolt", all are commonplaces of cuneiform literature.

To pretend that these similarities do not exist would be as dishonest as to refuse to see beyond them. And quite as foolish. For these chapters of Genesis not only grew up in a milieu in which the origins of things were expressed by means of such imagery (and it would be strange indeed if Genesis had made up an entirely new set of symbols), but were actually designed to attack those prevalent notions on the beginnings. To read Gen. i in isolation is to miss its true purpose as a counterstatement of the Babylonian creation myth. To refuse to recognize the imagery of Gen. ii-iii as borrowed imagery is to misunderstand its true purpose as a polemic against the Babylonian concept of man's relationship to God (not least in the question of sex). The chasm between the Bible and Babel is not fully appreciated until it is understood that the one has only borrowed the other's mode of expression in order to make an indictment of it. To fasten on to that mode of expression as if it existed in its own right is to miss half the meaning of these chapters.

If this must be said about Gen. i-iii, it must be said with even more emphasis about Gen. iv-xi. For here it is not merely the language, mode of expression and imagery which are reminiscent of Babel, but the very stories themselves. Here Bible and Babel are not merely dressed in the same clothes, but are obviously blood relations. Babel has its list of ten antediluvian Patriarchs like the Bible, and in many cases even the names tally. As for the Flood, it is common knowledge that Babylonian literature had its own version of the catastrophe; what is not always realized is that in detail after detail (the warning, the building of an Ark, the divine specifications, the escape, the birds, the mountain in Ararat, the sacrifice, even the etymology of the hero's name) the two stories run so strictly parallel that

nobody can doubt their common source. How are we to explain this similarity, we might almost say identity?

Perhaps it would be fairer to ask another question first: what precisely have we a right to expect from these chapters? Their author is faced with the problem of filling the gap between Adam (ch. i-iii) and Abraham (ch. xiiff.) If we place Adam at a conservative 500,000 B.C. (many would place him earlier) and Abraham at a conservative 2000 B.C. (he was almost certainly later), the gap still measures 498,000 years. To ask for the history of this period in any strict sense would be to ask for the moon. Even the modern historian, with all his scientific apparatus, has not the means to begin the attempt. In the abstract it would have been possible for God to reveal an outline of these years to the author, but in the concrete there is no indication that he did so, nor any reason why he should: his revelation of the unknown is concerned with things which will help us reach him.

It used to be the fashion to ascribe the source of the information contained in these chapters to the so-called "primitive tradition" mentioned above. From the very beginnings of mankind, a record of these facts would have been passed on by word of mouth from father to son through the whole period of the antediluvian patriarchs. Of these Methuselah would be long-lived enough (in fact so long-lived that unless we are careful with our calculations he is still alive after the Flood) to hand on the tradition to his grandson Noah, and thus the tradition would, by means of his three sons, the ancestors of the post-diluvian world, reach all peoples. The tradition would have been kept in its original purity by the Chosen People, worshippers of the one true God, but gradually distorted by other less favoured nations, in such a way, however, that its ultimate origin was still discernible.

It was Fr Lagrange who, at the end of the last century, exposed this explanation for the romantic extravaganza that it is. It was a possible theory only as long as man was thought to be merely a few thousand years old, but how is one to conceive of the transmission of such a tradition over half a million years? How was it ever possible for such an untarnished tradition to reach the Hebrews, who did not exist as a monotheistic people

(and made no bones about admitting it, cf. Jos. xxiv, 2) until Abraham? Why, finally, does the Hebrew account of this imaginary primitive tradition, supposedly common to all peoples, bear no relation at all to those of Egypt or India or South America, but only to those of Mesopotamia? Is it not precisely here that we come to the true solution?

To fill in the gap between Adam and Abraham, the author of Gen. iv-xi (or authors; the question is here immaterial) had no revelation from God to supply him with the necessary information. Nor had he any primitive tradition carefully passed from father to son until it reached him. All that he had was, so to speak, what he stood up in: the heritage of the race from which he stemmed and of the neighbouring peoples with whom he came into contact. In other words, his only source of information about the distant past was in the vague and confused conglomeration of popular traditions, legend and folklore which go to make up a nation's memory. It provided some sort of record of man's beginnings, of the origins of the arts and civilization, of the great happenings in the past in that area of the world. It cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called history.

For what could such unpromising material be used? Certainly not for the sake of its historical value—this must be judged on its own merits, not from its inclusion in the Bible—but for the only purpose in the author's mind, to teach religion. Some link had to be provided to tie up the great truths of the beginning with the origins of his own people in the person of Abraham, and these stories were the only material he had to hand to forge that link. But through them he could show the God of Gen. ii-iii acting throughout man's prehistory, taking the same attitude to sin, making the same promise of a salvation which is eventually to become concrete in Abraham. When the stories have been used in such a way, the reality of the events underlying them no longer matters: they have been given a timeless value far beyond the meaning they had for Babel. In fact, the more closely the author has depended upon Babel, the more significant will be the slightest variation he has made on the original story, for this will stand out all the more clearly as his own distinctive contribution, and the whole purpose of his

writing: a God who controls the destiny of all, who is vitally interested in his creation, but who will brook no attempt made on his sovereignty; a God who is yet a God of mercy, willing to save those who remain close to him, and through them the rest of creation. That alone is important in these chapters, the rest is secondary. To concentrate on the rest, to treat these stories as a simple record of facts asserted for their own sake, to defend their "basic historicity", all this is a rather misguided act of reverence for an author who might well be horrified that we had not penetrated to his true meaning.

These thoughts have been inspired by a number of excellent books which have recently appeared, all of them written for the general public rather than the specialist, and all of them insisting on using Babylonian parallels as one of the clues to the meaning of Genesis. The first two titles in a series of small books designed to make the results of biblical archaeology available at a popular level, newly translated from the French, have as their purpose precisely the light that the literature of ancient Mesopotamia can throw on the early chapters of Genesis.¹ Their author, curator-in-chief of the French National Museum and director of the French archaeological expeditions in Mesopotamia, speaks with the authority of the expert, yet has a manner of presentation which will capture the interest even of the uninitiated. His treatment of the Flood makes it clear how closely related is the biblical account to the various cuneiform versions which have been discovered, all deriving from a common tradition about some severe inundation in the Mesopotamian river basin in prehistoric times. Excavations have provided abundant evidence that there were several of these, and it seems that the violence and destruction of one of them had already been exaggerated by legend into a stock story long before it was adapted by the author of Gen. vi-ix to serve his religious purpose. The Tower of Babel in Gen. xi is similarly shown to have its roots firmly in Babylonian soil, and to be a Hebrew interpretation of one of the numerous *ziggurats* of

¹ *Studies in Biblical Archaeology*. No. 1. *The Flood and Noah's Ark* (Pp. 76); No. 2. *The Tower of Babel* (Pp. 75). By André Parrot. Translated by Edwin Hudson (Philosophical Library, New York, 1955. \$2.75 each). Further titles are available on Ur, Nineveh, the Jerusalem Temple, and Golgotha.

which cuneiform texts, ancient representations and archaeological excavations have witnessed the existence from the third millennium B.C. Babylon's own *ziggurat*, destroyed not once but several times in its long history, rose to 300 feet, a gigantic building in any age, for it would have topped the tower of Westminster Cathedral. Their purpose was clearly a religious one (like that of Jacob's vision at Bethel in Gen. xxviii), to provide a stairway for the gods to come down to be among men: Professor Parrot calls them "the cathedrals of antiquity". That such structures should provide material for a Hebrew satire on Babylon's self-sufficiency is not surprising, and the pained bewilderment shown by the author in his last chapter should have warned him not to venture into theology, where he is clearly a stranger. We remain grateful to him for guiding us so intelligibly round his own field of archaeology and giving us the means to a fuller understanding of Genesis. Both books are amply illustrated with maps, drawings and photographs.

Fr Hauret¹ is also eager to draw attention to Babel in his delightful book on the first three chapters of Genesis, and to show how Abraham's origin in Mesopotamian Ur necessarily meant that his people would share the terminology, customs, science and even ideas of Mesopotamia. "The divine call which drew him forth from polytheism did not cancel out his secular culture" (p. 152). He insists therefore on facing up squarely to any parallel which can be established between Bible and Babel, and is severe (insofar as such a charming author can be severe) against any attempt to find a solution to the problems of these early chapters of Genesis either in an imaginary "primitive traction" or in its fellow figment of "concordism", which tries to establish a strict harmony between the Bible and the findings of science. Genesis is not a text-book designed to give us the sort of information which the sciences would later confirm, but a book of religious teaching, and this is conveyed, in these early chapters in particular, by means of traditions which do not always agree in their mode of presentations, and which we should be no more concerned to reconcile than was their author. It is the aim of Fr Hauret's book to show this mode of presentation for

¹ *Beginnings: Genesis and Modern Science* (Pp. xv + 304). By Charles Hauret. Translated by E. P. Emmans, O.P. Priory Press, Dubuque, 1955. \$3.25.

what it is, and to reveal beneath it the doctrinal content of these fundamental pages in the story of God's relations with man. With its preliminary chapter of general introduction to the Bible (whose human and divine features are so frequently misunderstood), and the deeply thought out concluding chapter on the practical application of this approach to Genesis in the classroom, in discussion groups and in the pulpit, the book cannot fail to appeal to a wide public, even to those who might take scandal at this "modernistic" treatment of Genesis, and whose fears are voiced and answered in the final pages. The English edition has improved on the original French both in its inclusion of a number of maps and sketches and (inevitably) in its price.

Like Fr Hauret, Fr Vawter¹ is concerned over the reluctance of Catholics to have any more contact with the Bible than by way of the snippets which they may overhear at their weekly Mass. "The average Catholic today is about as familiar with the pages of Holy Writ as he is with the *Bhagavad Gita*" (p. 4). Nor does he see any solution to the problem in the oft-repeated advice to "read the New Testament first", as if this reputedly "easier" part of the Bible would make any sense to one who had not grasped the fundamental truths of the Old Testament with which it forms one book. Fr Vawter therefore writes "on the premise that it may just be possible to restore Bible reading by guiding the reader through the part which should be read first in any worthwhile book, the beginning" (p. 6). And after a twelve-page introduction on "Why Genesis Was Written" (stressing the essentially religious nature of this history), and a further eight pages on "How Genesis Was Written" (a section which the reader is asked to refer to frequently during the course of the book), he puts on his guide's cap and begins. He spares himself no pains: even the text of Genesis (the American Confraternity edition) is printed out in full before it is commented ("This is intended to be a guide through Genesis, not a handy substitute for it", p. 27). Yet he finished his task within the compass of 300 pages, each of which successfully conceals, beneath a style that is at all times delightful and sometimes

¹ *A Path through Genesis* (Pp. 308). By Bruce Vawter, C.M. Sheed & Ward, 1957. 18s.

almost racy, the profound scholarship that has gone into the making of them. It is particularly refreshing to find the stories of Genesis dealt with throughout on the level of "traditions", so that the reader learns from the beginning to look for the religious purpose for which they have been used, and is not constantly distracted by the merely superficial question of their historical accuracy. With its maps, diagrams and sketches (plenty of Babel here too), the book is the complete beginner's guide to Genesis in English, the first from a Catholic pen that can be recommended without any reserve.

It is just ten years (16 Jan. 1948) since the Biblical Commission gave its blessing to studies connected with the relationship between Bible and Babel, confident that "a closer and unprejudiced examination of the literary methods of the ancient oriental peoples, of their psychology, of their manner of expressing themselves, and even of their notion of historical truth" could do nothing but aid us towards a fuller understanding of the first eleven chapters of Genesis. These books illustrate the progress that has been made in this direction. If their tone (especially of the last one) is still rather defensive, if they still seem (like this article itself) too concerned at every turn to justify this new approach to Genesis, it is perhaps because they are embarrassingly conscious of the many readers, especially in the English speaking world, to whom such an approach will still appear strange and suspect. Such readers would do well to consider again the rebuke administered by Pius XII to the "indiscreet zeal which considers everything new to be for that very reason a fit object for attack or suspicion" (*Divino Afflante*, 30 Sept. 1943). Perhaps in another ten years' time we can take the apologetics as read, and get down to the more positive and rewarding task to which the same encyclical directs our attention, of expounding the theological riches of Genesis.

H. J. RICHARDS

THE PROBLEM OF
CLERGY IN LATIN AMERICA

II

IN a previous article I outlined what is an extremely serious problem for the Church in Latin America—the grave scarcity of priests—and set it against the background of Spanish missionary effort throughout three centuries. Although it was perhaps inevitable that the Spanish dominions in the New World would sooner or later demand their independence, the actual liberation brought a number of disadvantages for the Church. When one is dealing with an area as vast and a population so varied as Latin America and the Latin Americans, it is not easy to lay down causes and circumstances that are everywhere operative. Conditions vary considerably, at times radically, from one country to another. There are, however, a number of factors which need to be examined.

One of these, which had nothing to do with the movement for independence, was the loss of missionaries, in particular the expulsion of the Jesuits by the Spanish government, in the second half of the eighteenth century. Of the experiments in Paraguay I spoke in a previous article. Its abandonment was a tragedy both for the Church and the Indians. But there are other figures which show how grave were the consequences of this expulsion. At that time 400 Jesuits were active in Chile among a population of 400,000; there was one priest for every thousand people. Today the proportion is one for 3123—and Chile, be it remembered, has the second best ratio of priests to people in the whole of Latin America. In Mexico, the Society of Jesus then had charge of twenty-two colleges, nineteen schools and ten seminaries, with a strength of three hundred priests; a further hundred were working among the Indians in the North-West. These missionaries were to some extent replaced by secular clergy, but the educational work to a large extent lapsed. The seminaries were shortly afterwards closed, and the forty-one colleges and schools were soon reduced to five. Of the eleven colleges run by the Society of Jesus in Peru only one

survived their departure, though here, as in Mexico, attempts were made to carry on missionary work among the Indians.

The wars of independence which lasted from 1810 till 1824 had a most disturbing effect, especially in Colombia and Venezuela. Not only was the rhythm of missionary work sadly interrupted but many of the clergy themselves were actively engaged in the national movements. Over a hundred priests were in command of military groups and units during the fighting in Mexico. At the farther end of the sub-continent, in Argentina, seventeen priests were members of the first revolutionary assembly in 1810 which set up an independent government. Nearly one-half of the deputies—fifteen out of thirty-three—elected to the first Parliament of 1812 at Buenos Aires, were again clerics, as were sixteen of the twenty-nine members of the Congress of Tucumán who drew up the Argentine declaration of independence. It cannot therefore be maintained that the Church was unsympathetic to the movement of liberation, that is if the attitude of the Church is to be judged by the reaction of its clergy. On the other hand, Masonry exerted a powerful influence. The "philosophers" and Deists who paved the way for the French Revolution in Europe did something to prepare the break away from Spain in Latin America. The instructor that made the most lasting impression on Bolívar when he was in Europe was Simón Carreño Rodríguez, a disciple of Rousseau, who introduced his young pupil to the works of Hobbes, Hume and Spinoza as also to those of Rousseau and Voltaire. Bolívar himself was possibly a Freemason. Certainly, Miranda was a Mason and, according to Bernardo O'Higgins, who is known as the *Libertador* of Chile, Miranda established the *Lautaro Lodge* which under its other names of *Caballeros Racionales* or *Gran Reunión Americana* helped to co-ordinate the independence movement. San Martín, the principal figure in the Argentine struggle against Spain, was definitely a Freemason. Bartolomé Mitre, the biographer of San Martín and himself President of Argentina, declared that the liberation in both Argentina and Chile was greatly facilitated through centres of Masonry. Yet it does not follow that the movement was anti-religious or even anti-clerical in itself. In one sense, it was a civil war between peoples who had been

closely linked for centuries, and there were ardent Catholics on both sides. However, a tendency did develop later to identify the Church with Spain and accordingly to stimulate a certain anti-Church feeling in the new Latin American States.

The damage and disruption occasioned by fifteen years of war were serious enough, but they were followed by a period of uncertainty in which the position of the Church was weakened. The Church fell, as it were, between the two stools of the Spanish government in Europe and the new Latin America governments. By the Papal bulls, *Inter Cetera* of Alexander VI (1493) and *Universalis Ecclesia* of Julius II (1508) the Spanish crown was granted the prerogative of presenting candidates for episcopal sees in Latin America. After the wars of independence there was an interregnum. The Spanish crown presented no names for the dioceses and did not recognize the new governments. These governments, on the other hand, claimed they had succeeded to all the rights of Spain in the New World, including this privilege of proposing candidates for bishoprics. The result for several years was chaotic. When bishops died, no replacements could be made; it was not clear which government had the right of presenting them. In 1830, for example, only two of the ten Mexican dioceses had bishops. A bishop was appointed to the see of Buenos Aires in 1834 but only after it had been vacant for twenty years, and it was not until 1829 that Pope Leo XII was able to nominate a bishop for Peru. That same year, the last bishop left Guatemala, and he had been the sole remaining bishop in Central America. In Colombia, there was one bishop only, at Popayán, and in Venezuela, again only one at Mérida; there was none in Ecuador.¹

My earlier mention of Masonry reminds us of another factor that has seriously complicated the Church situation in Latin America. In certain States and at certain periods it has suffered considerably from Masonic and Radical governments.

Only three years had elapsed in Argentina from the start of the national movement in 1810 when regulations were passed by the Congress General, limiting the freedom of the Church. No one was permitted, for instance, to make a solemn religious

¹ These details are taken from an article in *Revista Javeriana* for July 1955, by Fr Alvarez Mejía, entitled, "Balance Religioso de América Latina".

profession under the age of thirty. Local religious superiors were forbidden to correspond with their major superiors in Rome, and bishops were commanded to exercise their jurisdiction without reference either directly to Rome or to Apostolic delegates. Papal documents were to have no validity in the country until they had been submitted to and approved by the civil authority. Seven years later, in 1820-21, Rivadavia added other restrictive and positively anti-religious measures. Mixed marriages were authorized by the State, and religious congregations suppressed. Church property was confiscated and priests of any other nationality than that of Argentina forbidden entrance to the country. It was at this period that Mgr Muzi, delegate of the Holy See for Chile, passed through Argentina, accompanied by Giovanni Mastai Feretti, afterwards Pope Pius IX. The prelate was prevented from giving the sacrament of confirmation and from exercising his episcopal functions. It is generally thought that Rivadavia entertained the notion of a national Church, and in those days of heated and intemperate national sentiment he did not entirely lack clerical support. The situation improved later, and in 1853 the Catholic religion was recognized by the new constitution as enjoying a privileged position. However, in 1884, the schools were laicized and it was only after the 1943 revolution that religious instruction could again be introduced into State schools.

The position in Mexico was for a long time even more disastrous. In the latter half of the nineteenth century education was completely secularized. No religious congregation was allowed to own or administer property, and the struggle between the Church and Radical, and later revolutionary, governments culminated in the active persecution of the early twentieth-century decades.

A further instance is found in Honduras, where detailed anti-Church legislation is on the statute book, though in practice much of it has become a dead letter. Divorce had been introduced despite the opposition of the Church: any testament or legacy in the Church's favour is regarded as null and void; the clergy may not hold public office and no foreign priest may work in the country. The constitution of 1945 contains several anti-religious clauses. Article 29 forbids Church or clergy to

engage in any work of social justice. Article 32 banishes all religious orders. And, while the Church is declared incapable of possessing property, article 86 makes the State the sole proprietor of all ecclesiastical effects. A law of 1947 forbade all Catholic radio transmissions and in 1948 the *Radio Pax*, that had belonged to the Archbishop, was closed down, on the grounds that it was improper that there should be private broadcasting from a religious building, since that was State property.

CONSEQUENCES

Some of the consequences of these varied factors may be given briefly. They bear very directly indeed on our main theme, that of the scarcity of clergy in Latin America.

First of all, some figures of clergy. In 1810, the year of the break away from Spain, there were as many priests in Buenos Aires as in 1910, one century later, though the population had grown, probably tenfold.

The island of Cuba had 779 priests in 1857 for one million people. In 1954 there were only 670 priests for six million people; five and a half million of these Catholic.

Guatemala had 527 priests in 1749 for two million inhabitants; it possesses today three million inhabitants but only 192 priests.

The figures for Mexico should be reproduced in detail:

	1810	1850	1955
Population	6,122,354	7,661,919	25,986,772
Secular clergy	4,229	2,084	4,263
Religious priests	3,112	1,139	1,191
Total number of priests	7,341	3,223	5,454
No. of people per priest	823	2,376	4,766

Within forty years, from 1810 to 1850, the Mexican population increased by a million and a half whereas the total of priests declined to one half. A century afterwards, the Church had to work with two thousand priests less than in 1810 among a population which had grown fourfold.

These vicissitudes of Latin-American clergy are reflected in

the story of colleges and seminaries of Latin America. In many cases they were closed by State intervention; elsewhere they have frequently declined through want of adequate staff and suitable students. There were occasions in which a local clergy had to be improvised because of the expulsion or the sheer shortage of European priests. The results were sometimes unfortunate. Unsuitable young men were ordained without sufficient formation. There was one period when such methods were adopted in Honduras, with the consequence of a lasting prejudice against the clergy among better-class families and of a lack of respect for clergy. Social considerations have sometimes aggravated the scarcity of students, as in Peru where candidates for the priesthood were drawn from very poor families, again with a loss of prestige and respect. It has been further accentuated by racial origin or admixture, for instance in Bolivia, where the priests are in the main *mestizos*, and there are scarcely any vocations from the fifteen per cent minority of whites. Finally, there has been the wholesale interference with clerical training, as recently in Mexico. There the novitiates of all religious congregations were closed in 1914; only the Jesuits and Franciscans were able to retain them, by transferring them to Spain and the United States. Three years subsequently, all the seminaries were also shut.

OTHER FACTORS

Hitherto I have been considering what might be termed "religious" factors or more precisely, political and historical elements which have complicated the religious situation and have been in part the causes and in part the occasions of this decline of clergy.

However, to obtain a complete picture, we have to consider briefly one or two other elements.

The first is the rapid increase of population during the past eighty years. This has not been constant nor evenly spread through the sub-continent. In Mexico, for example, the growth of population between 1810 and 1950 was fourfold. In Argentina, between 1850 and 1950, it was something like fourteen or

fifteen-fold. Population has developed most quickly where there has been large-scale immigration from Europe, and this has happened in the South rather than the North, for obvious climatic reasons, and has affected Argentina and Southern Brazil, with Chile and Uruguay, more than the other Latin-American countries. Developing agriculture and now industry and oil continue to draw a large stream of immigration from the European mainland.

This has meant a build up of a large white population, distinct from the Criollo and Indian inhabitants of earlier days. This white percentage, found to some extent in all States but particularly evident in the South, amounts to close on one third of the whole. In the main of Latin origin, Spanish but also Italian, it includes many Germans, Yugoslavs, French and even British and Irish, the last-named in Argentina. These people, though many are now settlers in the third or fourth generation, remain to a large extent European in habits of thought and life, and their religious problems do not differ widely from those in Europe. But gradually they are assuming an *American* outlook, not necessarily identical with that of the United States, but growing out of the vast extent, climate, traditions of Latin America. Except in some instances of planned emigration from Europe, the immigrants did not bring clergy with them, so that the rate of growth swiftly outpaced religious provision. Many, if not most, of the immigrants were peasants or artisans, and it is only in the third generation that their children have been able to enjoy an education comparable to that of grammar schools in Britain. Only in relatively recent years have they been in a state to provide candidates for priestly studies. In other words, Latin America is now faced with problems similar to those of the United States in the mid-nineteenth century. There would seem to be no reason why, in a very long-term view, these problems should not be solved in the South as they have been in the North of that great continent.

A smaller half of the population, perhaps forty-five per cent, is of mixed origin or *mestizo* and ranges from the near-European to the near-Indian. Its manner of life again varies from the European in the larger cities to the simple, primitive existence of the Indians themselves. The blacks form the third element,

some twelve to thirteen per cent, mostly in the Caribbean and in Central and Northern Brazil; the Indians proper form roughly twenty per cent. They are widely distributed through Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and the Central American States. Among them considerable differences have to be noted but the level of life, for example, in Peru and Guatemala is very primitive indeed.

A second factor is topography, for some of the country is very formidable, for instance, the Andean *alto plano* and the equatorial hinterland of Brazil, and the ignorance among the more simple inhabitants because of these natural obstacles. It has been commented that there are only two sacraments in Latin America: baptism and processions, and certainly external show is an important feature among the *mestizos* and Indians. But this outward expression is at the same time a mark, if not always of interior conviction, at least of an inner desire for the faith. Indeed there is surprising evidence of the survival of faith and devotion despite the lack of priests. Fr Luzzi is adamant that this is due in the main to three factors: the heroic sacrifice of the original missionaries that has left so firm a Catholic stamp upon the sub-continent; the generosity of the original conversions; and finally, to the Indian devotion to our Lady. He recounts the story of an old peasant in the Argentine countryside who became a Protestant because no priest was available in that district; he himself was elderly and he felt the need to pray; the Protestant minister at least gathered them together on Sundays for prayer. A short time afterwards, he declared that he returned to his Catholic faith and practice. The minister had spoken badly of our Lady, so they had chased him out of the district.

The factors I have already numerated have had their effect in this spread of ignorance. Catholic schools, insufficient in number and equipment, have been too often and too seriously interfered with. Fr Luzzi quotes a sad comment from Honduras: "Our forbears learnt their catechism both in schools and in their homes; our parents learned it only at home; today's children are learning it neither at school nor at home; it is forbidden to teach it in the schools, and they have lost the habit of teaching it at home."

GROUNDS FOR HOPE

I have been outlining a serious and critical situation, which by the very nature of things cannot be speedily remedied. However, there exist grounds for hope. In fact, the position is being gradually bettered.

Mexico is perhaps the most favourable case in point, and here one recalls the saying of Tertullian, that it is the martyrs' blood that is the seed of the Church. I have mentioned above that Mexico at the moment has 5454 priests (the figure includes 1191 religious)—two thousand fewer than were working in that country in 1810. However, the situation there may very soon be wholly transformed for the number of students in *major* seminaries, that is studying philosophy or theology in immediate preparation for the priesthood, is 2886. Even allowing a generous margin of "wastage" and taking the normal seminary course as six years, this could easily provide an additional four hundred priests per annum. Should the vocation rate be maintained, the religious state of Mexico might be transformed within twenty years. Current Mexican figures include also: 1784 men religious, inclusive of several hundred students who will be ordained later, and 13,430 women religious, with a total of 1434 religious houses. Only Colombia, Argentina and Brazil have a larger number of religious (men and women together) with 13,986, 17,338 and 28,811 respectively.

Not long ago, I studied the statistics for the various Jesuit provinces and vice-provinces in Latin America. They are about eight or nine in number and in every case but one there were more unordained students than ordained priests. This means that these provinces have more young members under thirty to thirty-two than older members above that age limit. And, further, practically all these students will be Latin Americans, though many of the older men, now working in various Latin Americans, are Europeans.

Finally, a notable improvement can be recorded since 1953. Between 1953 and 1955 nearly three thousand more priests were added to the total strength. The number of men religious

CLERGY IN LATIN AMERICA 413

advanced by two thousand and of women religious by four thousand. Here are the relative details:

				1953	1955
Priests	29,039	31,894
Seminarists	6,084	7,122
Religious houses		
(Men)	3,332	3,592
(Women)	7,225	7,735
Religious		
(Men)	22,939	24,983
(Women)	73,145	77,631
Schools	10,996	13,111
Pupils	2,038,569	2,264,514

PROTESTANT MISSIONS

I have said nothing of a further problem which underline, the great need for more priests throughout Latin Americas namely the growth of Protestant missionary activity. A number of Protestant groups have always functioned there, for example, the English, Scots and some of the Germans, just as more recently there are groups for the Orthodox churches. Large-scale Protestant penetration dates from 1910 when, under pressure from the Protestant churches of the U.S.A., the decision was adopted to devote time and propaganda to Latin America. Protestant congresses were held at Panama in 1916, at Montevideo in 1925 and in Havana in 1929. The movement has received a great impetus in the last twenty years, since conditions for Protestant missionaries have become increasingly difficult in the Far East. A missionary congress held at Madras in 1938 was the occasion when it was decided to concentrate now on the States of Latin America.

The present situation may be briefly reviewed in data from a report prepared for the General Congress of the Latin-American Catholic hierarchy at Rio de Janeiro in July 1955, summarized in *Sal Terrae* for March 1956.

The number of different Protestant "bodies"—most of them from the U.S.A. and many unknown in Europe—rose between 1938 and 1952 in nearly all the Southern countries of America. In Argentina from 20 to 38; in Bolivia from 12 to 22; in Brazil

from 18 to 35; in Colombia from 9 to 22; in Cuba from 8 to 17 and in Chile from 9 to 17. Similar figures exist for the remaining States.

With regard to missionaries themselves, the numbers increased between 1940 and 1950 as follows: Baptists from 169 to 348; Lutherans from 81 to 149; Methodists from 317 to 500. From the same source we learn that the total of Protestant missionaries in Latin America has developed from 944 in 1903, to 1233 in 1911, to 2107 in 1925, 2414 in 1938 and now 5688 in 1952.

The actual number of "Protestants", that is of men and women who belong to these numerous and very varied religious bodies, cannot be calculated with any certainty. What is, however, evident is that it has been rapidly on the increase. It rose from a small number like 50,000 in 1890 to 325,000 in 1925 and 600,000 in 1938. It was more than a million and a half in 1949 and it exceeds three million today. The area of greatest concentration lies in Portuguese rather than Spanish America for the claim is now made that there are two million Protestants in Brazil, which makes the previous figure I suggested of "three million" a very conservative estimate. An article in *Broteria* for October 1955, gave the following details. In 1889 there were 143,793 Protestants in Brazil, one per cent of the population, and practically all of these were immigrants from Europe. By 1940 it had risen to 1,074,857—2.61 per cent of the total—and ten years later to 1,741,430—3.35 per cent. Many of the Protestant missionaries come from the United States, but in spite of this, four-fifths of them are now Brazilians. There exist in Brazil fifty-five different Protestant bodies with probably four thousand five hundred ministers (the data are incomplete) and 5897 churches or temples; in addition they have more than eight thousand Sunday Schools, with 36,335 official teachers and more than half a million pupils. Much of their propaganda is very modern; they possess broadcasting stations in a number of places, chiefly in Central America and Brazil—especially, be it noticed, in the countries in which United States influence is strongest. In Sao Paulo in Southern Brazil, they have a university with five faculties, twelve institutes of higher studies, eighty-eight colleges and nearly five hundred primary schools. This

swift increase of Protestant activity in Latin America is another reason why Catholics, both in the countries in question and everywhere else in the Church, should at least *pray* and, wherever and however possible, *work* for a speedy growth of priests in Latin America and for an apostolic revival in these lands, to which in the past so much Catholic effort was dedicated and so much love given.

JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MANY MASSES AND THE ONE SACRIFICE

WHEN Origen was brought to question Bishop Heracleides about the mystery of the Trinity, he soon had the bishop tied up in the intricacies of Trinitarian theology, largely owing to the lack of a developed terminology for expressing the difference of nature and person; it is not difficult to repeat the achievement of Origen when one begins to examine the Catholic theology of the Mass and its relation to the sacrifice of the Cross. Luther could inveigh against the multiplication of Masses and call for a text from the NT which mentioned sacrifice in this connexion, but to a modern Catholic theologian he was doing no better than Heracleides did when faced with Origen's questions. It may be hoped that from what I shall have to say another Origen might frame a set of questions for Luther which would bring him to the state of mind of Heracleides.

There has been in recent times much loose talk among theological commentators about the impasse that theology had reached at the time of the Council of Trent, with Lutherans asserting a mere commemoration of Calvary in the liturgy and Catholics replying that their liturgy was a repetition of Calvary, but no attempt was made by the commentators to place these opposed views in the perspective of the theology of the time, to read Gabriel Biel on the one hand or the Acts of Trent on the other and see what lay behind the headlines of the debate. When one turns to the Acts of Trent, which I shall cite *in*

extenso, one can find considerable help towards the understanding of the Catholic position.

The first draft of the Tridentine decree says in its second chapter:

Though that single sacrifice of the Cross—if we consider its power and efficacy—destroyed the sins of the whole world, yet, since no one can according to the law of God ever receive the fruit of that offering, i.e. the remission of his sins and his salvation, unless he apply it to himself by way of sacraments and sacrifices, it must therefore needs be declared that this saving sacrifice of the Eucharist has been left to us by the Lord in order that by its very means, and quite apart from the other sacraments, the merit of the Passion may be made available not to one man or two but even to the whole Church, and in order that under the most perfect law of Christ there might be discovered an external and visible sacrifice by means of which the faithful might seek help and strength from God and gain it for their asking.

For if before the coming of Christ the hope of the Patriarchs was aroused by those sacrifices which foreshadowed the coming Redemption . . . and if stirred by these hopes they could draw down on themselves the benefit of His passion (as it were, desiring to apply it to themselves by anticipation), much more is it fitting that the benefit of Christ's death could be by this sacrifice of the Mass conferred upon Christians, in which the Lord is signified and included, not now to-be-offered but having-been-offered upon the cross. The victim is the same; Christ is the same, who offered Himself upon the cross and who is offered and immolated in this sacrifice to His Father; only the manner of offering is different. . . .

Just as those constant and unending prayers, which Christ is believed to pour forth for us to His Father as our advocate in heaven, take away nothing from that mighty prayer which He prayed to the Father for us upon the cross, where He was heard for His reverence, even so it is to be admitted that the sacrifice of the Mass, carried out in an unbloody manner, where Christ offers Himself to the Father, in no way abates the efficacy of that bloody sacrifice on the cross.

(*Conc. Trid.*, Acta VIII, 752.)

The theological argument which is set forth in this draft,

and which the Council did not think fit to incorporate in the final decree, though at the same time it did not repudiate any part of it, is that justification can be found for the distinction between the merit of Christ's Passion and its application to the individual from the OT, where the Patriarchs are seen to have had imperfectly and by anticipation what is offered to the individual who is born in the Christian centuries. Abel, Abraham and Melchisedec are figures who have always been associated with the Christian liturgy and it is from their status that a clue is to be derived for the interpretation of the way of salvation under the New Law. "Abraham rejoiced that he might see my day, he saw it and was glad." But the means offered to Abraham was but a feeble anticipation of what is made available to men of the new dispensation. There was then no sacrifice that was fully pleasing to God. Malachias glimpsed that there would be one, but it was only with the Epistle to the Hebrews and the early patristic writings such as the homily of Melito on the Passion that the fulfilment of this dream was proclaimed aloud.

Not in one place now, nor in a small compass, is the glory of God established, but unto the ends of the earth has His grace been poured forth and here has God the almighty pitched his tent through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever (Melito, 45).

The Tridentine draft appeals also to the argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ with prayers and a strong cry made satisfaction for us on the cross, and He was heard for His reverence, but yet He is ever living in heaven to make intercession for us. The paradox of these two juxtaposed statements is at least an excuse for setting forth the paradox that the redemption of the cross is all-sufficient and yet that there is still room for the multiplication of occasions when this satisfaction can be applied to men. We are on the brink of a mystery here. When I was an undergraduate I used to think that all metaphysical systems could be classified according as they held that the whole was greater than, equal to, or less than the sum of its parts; I now think that the Catholic theology of sacrifice would require a system in which the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

In the OT, as appealed to by the Epistle to the Hebrews, the ritual of the day of atonement demanded that there be not merely a carrying of the blood to within the Holy of Holies but also a sprinkling of the blood. "He shall take also of the blood of the calf and sprinkle with his finger seven times towards the propitiatory towards the East." (Lev. xvi, 14.) At the sacrifice of the red heifer, the priest, "dipping his finger in her blood shall sprinkle it over against the door of the tabernacle seven times." (Num. xix, 4.) "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who has by the Holy Ghost brought Himself as an offering unspotted to God, cleanse our conscience?" (Heb. ix, 14.) This *rantismos* (in the spirit of Heb. xii, 24) was understood in the patristic age to be two-fold; there was the incorporation by baptism into the death of Christ and his resurrection, and there was also the *rantismos* of the Eucharist, when the recipients moistened a finger at lips that were still wet with the blood of Christ and sprinkled this on their eyes and face and breast, as Cyril of Jerusalem told them to do. (*Myst. cat.* v, 21.) Melito exclaims in his new-found homily: "He it is who has sealed our souls with His own Spirit and the limbs of our body with His own blood." (*Hom. Pass.* xi, 8.) And the second Paschal homily (ii, 3), of those four that are variously attributed to Chrysostom or Hippolytus, says expressly: "Double was the entrance made by death, and double is the sealing."

The Epistle to the Hebrews (ix, 20) after recalling how Moses had to sprinkle the whole people with the blood, deliberately changes the wording of Exodus to make it conform to the phrasing of the Gospels and the Christian liturgy: "This is the blood of the covenant which God hath (not established for, but) enjoined upon you." The injunction to "do this in commemoration of Me" is not far from the thought of the writer, and therefore when he comes on in the following verses to emphasize the uniqueness of Christ's death it is not to rule out the renewal of His offering. As Sedulius Scotus said in the ninth century on this passage, summing up much patristic teaching now lost: "Even though we offer continually, it is always the same sacrifice, and not one lamb today and another tomorrow." (PL. 103: 265). The uniqueness of Christ's death is put forward by Paul to exclude the idea of a repeated dying (and therefore a re-

peated incarnation) of Christ; this is indeed the last age of the world, and Christ's sacrifice will last until He come.

The possibility of having a sacrifice truly one but nevertheless renewed countless times in the life of the Church is opened up by the use of the distinction between having and using (a distinction as old as Plato's aviary in the *Theaetetus*), but this is not the end of the story. Since the publication of this part of the *Acta* of the Council of Trent in 1919, and the almost simultaneous appearance of the great treatise *Mysterium fidei* by Père de la Taille, there has been much speculation among Catholic theologians about the nature of the heavenly sacrifice, or the manner in which Christ may be considered to exercise His eternal pleading for us. La Taille himself was in favour of a passive pleading, the simple presence of the glorified humanity of Christ before the Father, with those selfsame wounds He had in life; but not all are content with this. The question is put: How can Christ *act* in each Mass? It may be a pseudo-question, but tradition is not without some light to throw upon it: "There is an altar in heaven," says Irenaeus, "for thither are our prayers and our offerings directed" (*adv. haer.* 4, 31, 5). Ambrose adds:

We have seen our great high-priest come to us; we have seen and heard Him offer His blood for us. We follow Him, priests as best we may be, in offering sacrifice for the people; weak in merit but ennobled by the sacrifice we offer, for though Christ does not appear to be offered, yet He is offered on earth, when the Body of Christ is offered, and further He is manifested as offering in us, since it is His word that sanctifies the sacrifice that is being offered (in Ps. 37, 57).

With Cyprian's laconic *Passio enim est Domini sacrificium quod offerimus*, we seem to reach the Pauline boldness which made him say: "I fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my body, for the Church . . ." (Col. i, 24). The Passion of Christ goes on to the end of time, said Leo the Great, and it is inevitable, given the relation that exists between Christ and His body which is the Church, that His sacrifice should be somehow prolonged even as far,

From the recent discussions on the relation of the Mass to the Passion, it is clear that what must come last and not first is the adequate definition of sacrifice. Whether one takes La Taille's theory, that the Supper is the offering of the sacrifice to be accomplished, while the Mass is the offering of the sacrifice that has been accomplished, or whether one holds that there was a distinct act of offering by Christ on Calvary—perhaps in the *Consummatus est*—and that therefore there are two sacrifices, distinct in number but not in kind, is a matter of quite extensive debate not to be settled by presuming an arbitrarily chosen definition of sacrifice which would rule out all opposing views. One can perhaps make some progress through an examination of the idea of sacrifice in the religions of the natural man, though this will never yield more than a very generic idea of what God has chosen to be the particular sacrifice of His revealed religion. In particular it may be thought that the idea of destruction or immolation which is attached to the notion of sacrifice is really there *ratione peccati*, and that if there had been no original sin man would not have been moved to make his gifts to God irretrievable by destroying them, but could have been content to leave them there, as the Greeks left the *apheton*, the dedicated animal, free to wander about within the precincts of the pagan temple.

Another direction in which progress seems possible is by the turning of attention to the question of the Epiclesis, a matter on which the theorists of modern sacrifice-theology have been somewhat reticent. Liaison between liturgists and speculative theologians has never been quite perfect, and there are ways in which a more careful study of the earliest forms of the Epiclesis-prayer could help the theology of the Mass, but they cannot be given here, even in outline. There is finally something to be gained from an investigation of the idea of *katallage* in the NT and in the tradition. Serapion in his liturgy makes his priest say, just after the words of consecration of the bread and before those for the chalice: "We also, making the likeness of Thy death, have offered the bread, and beseech Thee to be reconciled, through this sacrifice, with all of us and to be merciful, God of truth." Was this the "word of reconciliation" that Paul (II Cor. v, 19) claimed God had put among Christians? *Katallage*

was for Paul something that God alone could do, something that was effective *ex opere operato*, as later theologians would say.

The liturgy of the West does not seem to betray the thought of Paul or of Serapion when it declares (*Secreta* of 9th Sunday after Pentecost, in the Roman Missal): *Quoties huius Hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur*. (As often as there is held a renewal of this Victim, so often is the work of our Redemption enacted.) *Commemoratio* in the Latin of the Leonine Sacramentary—where the prayer is first met with—means more than the simple act of calling back to mind; it implies a rehearsing or even a revisiting. It is, of course, the accepted word for translating the *anamnesis* of Lk. xxii, 19. The final word *exercetur* which now stands in the Roman Missal is not the original word that was used by the author of the prayer. In the Leonine Sacramentary the word is written *exeritur*, and this is also the reading of a fragmentary Irish sacramentary of the seventh–eighth centuries now at Regensburg. (Abbot Casel argued (*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 11 (1931), pp. 35–7) that this ending was more suitable for the rhythm of the *clausula*; the double spondee of *exercetur* being less natural than the metrical and accentual arrangement of—*ōnis exsēritur*. The meaning of *exeritur* would be in general “is brought forth”, or “is applied”. Augustine speaks of the soul applying each of the senses to their proper objects (*Sensus omnes exserit anima, oculos ad videndum*. . . .). Casel tried to make the word serve his theory of *Mysteriengegenwart* by claiming that it meant that through the outward celebration of the liturgy the hidden mystery of Redemption was here and now presented to us, but this does not seem to be the precise connotation of the word. Much rather does it support the traditional view that the liturgy *applies* the Redemption and *brings it out* even to us.

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TRANSFER FROM NULLITY SUIT TO
NON-CONSUMMATION PROCESS

When the evidence adduced in a matrimonial nullity suit points to non-consummation rather than nullity, art. 206 of the Instruction *Provida* allows the parties to substitute a petition for a papal dispensation from their marriage. At what stage in the nullity suit can the transfer to the non-consummation petition be made? And, if either or both of the parties agree to the petition, does this amount to a tacit renunciation of the plea of nullity, so that, if their petition is rejected, they cannot resume their suit at the point where it was interrupted? (C.)

REPLY

In art. 206 of the Instruction *Provida*,¹ the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments notably amplified the norm of canon 1963, §2. The law, as it now stands, provides for three situations which may arise in matrimonial nullity suits, the first two arising out of a plea of impotence, the third out of some other plea. Its effect can be summarized as follows: (1) If the evidence collected in the trial has not, in the judgement of the tribunal, established an allegation of impotence, but has proved non-consummation, and either or both of the parties have thereupon elected to petition for a papal dispensation from their marriage on this latter ground, there is no need for the special administrative investigation normally required in a claim of this kind, because the acts of the nullity suit, together with the arguments on which the judges based their conclusion, are presumed to be sufficient for the purpose. (2) If, on the other hand, the judges have found that the evidence collected, while failing to establish impotence and pointing rather to non-consumma-

¹ Cf. *A.A.S.*, 1936, XXVIII, p. 353; or Doheny, *Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases*, I, p. 339. For an English version, cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II, under can. 1960.

tion, does not suffice to prove it according to the requirements of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, the presiding judge or auditor is delegated by this article to *complete* the proofs in an administrative investigation. (3) If, in a suit tried on some other plea than impotence, the tribunal has decided that the alleged nullity cannot be proved, but that a highly probable doubt has arisen incidentally as to the non-consummation of the marriage, the parties are free to present a petition and the presiding judge or auditor is thereupon delegated to conduct the *full* administrative investigation, as prescribed in the *Regulae servandae*. What our correspondent apparently wants to know is the precise stage which the nullity suit must have reached, in each of these situations, before the non-consummation process can be substituted and expedited in the manner above described.

The answer to this question clearly depends on what the Sacred Congregation means by the clause, repeated in each case, "tribunalis iudicio", or "collegii iudicio". J. Casoria, who signs himself "a studiis S.C. de Sacramentis", is in no doubt. He holds firmly that, whatever the plea, the nullity suit must not only have been carried through to its proper conclusion—"peracto clausoque totius instantiae gradu", but the tribunal must have signified its judgement "regulari et definitiva sententia cum omnibus consecrariis iuridicis et practicis".¹ V. Bartocetti, Under-Secretary of the Congregation of the Sacraments, confirms this interpretation with the claim that "S. Congregationem de Sacramentis pluries scripsisse et solemne habere quod in casu tum impotentiae tum etiam aliorum nullitatis capitum tribunal 'iudicium suum' in forma verae sententiae reddat". He adds that this sentence must be duly communicated to the interested parties and, if either appeals against it, the acts must be sent to the higher tribunal; if, however, they renounce their right of appeal and request that the question be solved "via gratiae", the tribunal must proceed accordingly.² According to Casoria, this renunciation of the right of appeal must be "express, juridically drawn up and notified".³

¹ *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, 1950, LXXV, f. 3, pp. 474-6. Dr Conway, *Problems in Canon Law*, p. 292, appears to take the same view.

² Lega-Bartocetti, *Commentarius in Iudicia Ecclesiastica*, III, p. 215*.

³ *Loc. cit.*

We have discovered only one dissident from this interpretation of art. 206. J. Torre, professor of canon law at the Angelicum and advocate of the Sacred Consistory, distinguishes between the three cases.¹ In the first case, he claims, the tribunal can form the required judgement as soon as all the evidence has been collected and published, and can suspend the process before the sentence has been passed.² The second case is verified, according to his interpretation, when, even *before* the collection of the evidence for impotence has been concluded, it has already become clear to the judges, though not with full juridical proof, that the marriage is unconsummated. He takes art. 206 to mean that, at this juncture, the function of the collegiate tribunal comes to an end and the nullity trial gives way to the administrative investigation conducted by the presiding judge or auditor. His interpretation of the third case is not very clear, but presumably, as in the first, he considers it sufficient that the evidence of the nullity trial has been fully collected and published.

Respect is due to the opinion of an eminent professor who, according to his publisher, has had "forty years of professional experience in civil and ecclesiastical tribunals", but since he gives no convincing reason for his interpretation, we prefer that of Mgr Bartocetti who, as Under-Secretary of the Congregation, is presumably in an even better position to know its mind. The purpose of art. 206, according to the latter, is to forestall a probable grievance of the parties. Under the previous law of canon 1963, he tells us, it used commonly to happen that a tribunal, believing the proofs to be insufficient, e.g. for impotence, but sufficient for non-consummation, would forward the acts to the Sacred Congregation "*pro gratia*". If then the favour were refused, because of insufficient reasons, the parties, or one of them, would complain that the tribunal had wrongly thought proof of impotence to be lacking and would demand the prosecution of the trial. But, by then, the tribunal was suspect, as having already delivered its opinion, so that fresh judges had to be appointed and a fresh start made. "Ad aufer-

¹ *Processus Matrimonialis*, ed. 3, pp. 359 ff.

² He admits (*loc. cit.*) that in the first edition of his book he had written: "*processus in eo est ut in sententiam proferre extent iudices*".

endae omnes has ambages et difficultates, oportet ut tribunal *iudicium suum* de quo in art. 206, §1, in formam verae sententiae emittat, et partibus copiam appellandi, si velint, relinquat."¹

If this interpretation be accepted, the answer to our correspondent's second question would appear to be that the change-over to a non-consummation petition not merely amounts to a tacit renunciation by the parties of their nullity suit, but requires a previous declaration to that effect, inasmuch as they must first renounce their right of appeal against the sentence which has rejected their plea of nullity.

If, as may happen according to the norm of art. 91, an unfinished suit is abandoned and declared such by the tribunal, there is no need for it to be resumed and concluded, before a petition can be presented by either of the parties on the ground of non-consummation. But, in that case, art. 206 cannot be invoked, and the full administrative process of investigation, with previous delegation from the Holy See, is required.

PRE-CODE MARRIAGE OF A CATHOLIC IN A NON-CATHOLIC CHURCH

A priest, called to a dying woman not previously known to be a Catholic, found that her marriage to her non-Catholic husband had been contracted in a non-Catholic church, in 1907, and never convalidated. Having hastily obtained the signed promises from both parties and dispensed them from the impediment of mixed religion, by canon 1044, he convalidated their union and administered the last sacraments to the sick woman. Only afterwards did it occur to him to ask (1) whether an excommunication was incurred, in 1907, by a Catholic who married in a non-Catholic church; (2) if so, whether ignorance of the penalty would have excused the woman in question from incurring it; and (3) whether leave of the Ordinary must be obtained to absolve her *pro foro externo*, before again giving her Holy Communion. (M. T.)

¹ Loc. cit.

REPLY

If the marriage was contracted in England, it was not necessary to convalidate it, or, at least, not on the ground of its clandestinity. The Tridentine decree *Tametsi* was never binding in this country, through lack of promulgation, and therefore clandestine marriages of Catholics domiciled here were valid down to Easter Sunday, 19 April 1908, when *Ne Temere* came into force.

(1) The special excommunication, *latae sententiae* and reserved to the Ordinary, inflicted by canon 2319, §1, 1°, on "Catholics who contract marriage before a non-Catholic minister", did not exist until the new Code took effect on 19 May 1918. The woman in question did not therefore incur this particular censure when she married in 1907, and, since penal laws are not retroactive, she has not incurred it since. However, under the pre-Code law, as interpreted by Holy Office decisions,¹ she incurred the excommunication, *latae sententiae* and reserved *speciali modo* to the Holy See, levelled against heretics and their supporters ("fautores") by the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis* of 12 October 1869.²

(2) Wernz-Vidal quotes a Holy Office decision of 17 May 1892, to the effect that those who married before a non-Catholic minister incurred excommunication, "etsi censurae in scilicet fuerint".³ Since however, before the Code no less than now, contumacy was necessary to the incurring of a censure, and ignorance (other than crass) excused from it,⁴ the Holy Office must be presumed to have meant that those guilty of this public sin were to be treated in the external forum as being under censure, even if, through ignorance, they had not incurred it in the internal forum. It may well be, therefore, that the woman in question did not actually incur the excommunication for "support of heresy", but, until the contrary is proved, it is presumed in the external forum that she did.⁵

¹ *Collectanea S.C.P.F.*, nos. 1412, 1478, 1793.

² Gasparri, *Fontes C.I.C.*, n. 552.

³ *Ius Canonicum*, VII, n. 410, footnote 7. No answer of the date given is to be found in the *Collectanea S.C.P.F.*

⁴ Cf. Bargilliat, *Praelectiones Iuris Canonici*, II (1901), n. 1554, a.

⁵ Canon 2200, §2 maintains the pre-Code principle on this point.

(3) Her absolution and admission to Holy Communion is governed by the law of the Code. Since she was in danger of death when she made her confession, the priest validly absolved her from the censure of the internal forum (if she had in fact incurred it), by virtue of the comprehensive power given to him in canon 882. This remains true, even though, when he pronounced the words of absolution, the question of a censure had not even occurred to him, because the formula of sacramental absolution includes an explicit statement of his intention to absolve "ab omni vinculo excommunicationis . . . in quantum possum et tu indiges".¹ She can therefore be given Holy Communion *privately* without further ado. Indeed, by canon 2251, if scandal can be avoided, she can regard herself as absolved even for acts of the external forum, such as public Communion, unless the superiors of the external forum, not satisfied that absolution has been clearly received, choose to enforce the censure until absolution has been externally obtained.

It is, of course, the normal practice to bring cases of public heresy before the external forum of the Ordinary, but canon 2314, §2 does not positively require this; it merely says that *if* such a case is submitted to him, he can absolve, or delegate the faculty to absolve, in the external forum. Hence, according to Buys,² an act of heresy which, though materially public, is formally occult need not be submitted to the external forum unless abjuration and absolution in that forum is the only effective way of repairing or avoiding scandal. If therefore the woman's excommunication is publicly known, or if, as seems more likely, her long neglect of her religion has established a common presumption that she is not a Catholic, the priest should arrange for her reconciliation to the Church in the normal form for converts, before admitting her *publicly* to Holy Communion. As to whether leave of the Ordinary is required for this purpose, the priest should consult the wording of the faculty (if any) committed to him in his *pagella*; in some dioceses, leave is required only in the case of "neo-conversi",

¹ She is not bound to have subsequent recourse to the competent superior because canon 2252 (which canon 882 orders to be observed) limits this requirement to censures reserved *specialissimo modo*.

² *Periodica*, June 1950, p. 144 (quoting *Collectanea S.C.P.F.*, n. 1532).

i.e. those who have never been Catholics. If, on the other hand, no one knows of the excommunication and no scandal is likely to be given, she not only can, but should, be admitted without further formality to public Communion.

L. L. McR.

FLECTAMUS GENUA AT ORDINATIONS

Flectamus genua occurs in the ordinations to Minor Orders, is it to be omitted in Paschaltide? (C. R.)

REPLY

No rubric of the *Pontificale Romanum* says anything about omitting *Flectamus genua* in Paschaltide, nor do commentators on the ordination service (e.g. Martinucci, Moretti, Nabuco). Indeed S.R.C. gave an official reply to this query in 1905 (No. 4164). Asked if in an ordination on the Saturday Ember Day of Pentecost, or on a Sunday by Apostolic indult, the words *Flectamus genua* before each prayer were to be said, S.R.C. replied: "Yes, according to the Roman Pontifical."

OFFERTORY OF THE REQUIEM MASS

What is the explanation of the Offertory of the Requiem Mass which seems to be a prayer for the damned? (X.)

REPLY

The text of the Offertory antiphon of the Mass for the dead is indeed a conundrum. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century it has received the attention of no small number of distinguished theologians and liturgists, and a multitude of explanations—some of them certainly rather fantastic—have been put forward by them. Most of these have been attempts to

find an orthodox interpretation of the existing text as it stands, without studying its origin and history, and surely it is the historical approach—first suggested, it seems, by Franz in his *Die Messe in Deutschen Mittelalter* (1902), and developed by Dom Boniface Serpelli in his monograph *L'Offertorio della Messa dei Defunti* (1946)—which must give the clue to the enigma.

It is noteworthy that the idea of prayer for the damned is not confined to the offertory antiphon of the Requiem Mass but runs all through the liturgy of the dead. It is found in the Tract and *Dies irae* of the Mass, in the versicle *À porta inferi*, in the prayers *Non intres* and *Deus cui proprium* of the Absolution for the dead.

The writer of the text of the Offertory—which is abbreviated in our Missal, it was longer in the days when the Offertory procession was in vogue—is unknown. It is first found in a MS. of the tenth century, though its elements are to be found in texts of the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries, but it does not appear in a MS. of the Roman rite until the twelfth century. Our existing text is not corrupt—so the explanation of it is not to be sought in that direction—variants of it are but slight, and do not alter its meaning in the least. It has a certain Hebraic flavour in such a phrase as *os leonis*, and in the mention of Abraham; and it is redolent of texts of Holy Writ as one would naturally expect: *profundus lacus* is used in Isaiah (xiv, 15) for hell, *os leonis* recalls I Peter (v, 8) and II Timothy (iv, 17), and *tartarus*, a pagan term, is used by St Peter (II Peter, ii, 4); *obscurum* may well be an echo of *tenebrae exteriores* of Matthew (viii, 12) and of *caligo tenebrarum* of II Peter (iii, 17). The general tenor of the Offertory, its wealth of imagery, its repetitions, its florid style, do not suggest the precision, simplicity and sobriety of texts of Roman origin. The prayer is addressed to the second Person—which was not done in the Roman liturgy of the period—and with the title *Rex gloriae*, which was much used in Irish prayers. The invocation of the Archangel Michael as *psychopompus*, the guide of disembodied spirits, is not Roman, but Celtic, derived by the Gallican liturgies from the East, especially from Coptic sources. The whole thought content of the prayer—its primitive eschatology—is Celtic, and all this points to a Celtic authorship and use of the prayer. This theory

based on internal evidence is not without external testimony to support it. The text is found in the famous Codex of S. Gall (ninth century); and was added, it seems, by an Irish copyist in the tenth century to a ninth-century biblical MS. from Lorsch.

Now for the interpretation. We must not read into old texts the theology of a later age, and we must not look for precise and accurate ideas about the moment of death and life beyond the grave in a text of the tenth century. Only in the fourteenth century was there an official pronouncement by the Church in the Constitution *Benedictus Deus* of Pope Benedict XIII (1336) about the particular judgement and the settlement of the eternal fate of a soul immediately after death—a commonplace teaching of theology now. The Celtic eschatological ideas of an earlier period—derived from Eastern sources—thought of the soul after death having to undergo a long and dangerous journey towards heaven, conducted by an angel spirit (and the Archangel Michael was the most favoured guide) and harried on the way by evil spirits, still fighting for the possession of a soul whose eternal destiny was not yet determined. Some believed indeed, in early days, that the fate of any soul was not fixed until after the burial of its companion body; others thought that the final judgement of a person might even be long delayed after death. Accordingly, they naturally believed that prayer should be offered for the dead to save them from eternal damnation, hence the petitions of the Offertory antiphon. In any case, a clear-cut distinction between hell and Purgatory must not be expected in the theology of the tenth or eleventh century.

It would seem, then, that the text of the antiphon is frankly a prayer for escape from damnation offered even long after the death of the person for whom it is made. Apart from the Canon of the Mass, which is guaranteed to be free from error by the Council of Trent (session XXII, canon 6), no liturgical text is necessarily free from all theological error; there are in liturgical texts minor points whose accuracy may well be questioned. In general, we know that for centuries now these texts have been the object of careful scrutiny, and certainly no longer contain any major theological error. Indeed the text of the Offertory antiphon was referred to at the Council of Trent, but was not,

apparently, dealt with, and the Church has not deemed it necessary to eliminate or alter it. It is often possible to give an orthodox interpretation to a liturgical text which may not be fully in accord with the teaching of modern theologians, and this seems to have happened with the Offertory of the Requiem Mass. For long it has been regarded, in a general way, as a prayer for the souls in Purgatory, and thought of as retroactive in its effects to the moment of death, when its terms would be fully applicable.

BLESSING OF MARRIAGE RING

At a wedding may a ring be blessed for the bridegroom, as is done in countries abroad, and, should he lose it later, may another be blessed and with what form of blessing? (J. M.)

REPLY

The marriage rite is more influenced by usage than the rites followed in the administration of other Sacraments. In England and Ireland it is not customary for married men to wear a wedding-ring as they do in many countries abroad, but there is no reason why they should not, and then a bridegroom's ring would be blessed with that of his bride at the wedding service. Provision is not made in the Roman Ritual for the blessing of two rings, nor in the *Ordo Administrandi* or *The Small Ritual* derived from it; but in the new *Collectio Rituum* approved for U.S.A. in 1954 provision is made for blessing two rings, and indeed the prayer from the Roman Ritual, *Benedic*, is first given in the plural, and only afterwards in the singular. Presumably, both rings may be blessed here if the parties so desire, and if the Ordinary does not rule otherwise. *S.R.C.* when asked about the practice of blessing two rings for the diocese of Toledo as found in the local ritual, replied, "Nihil innovetur." If a ring be lost it would seem that a new one might be blessed with the *Benedictio ad Omnia*.

J. B. O'C.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Little Breviary. Pp. xxiii + 1914. (J. H. Gottmer, Antwerp, and Burns Oates, 1957. 4 guineas.)

THE *Little Breviary* has been compiled "for the use of both religious and layfolk containing in simplified form all the Offices of the Roman Breviary". It first appeared in Dutch (1952), having been prepared by Fr Stallaert, C.SS.R., of Roermond, and then received the highest praise from the Sovereign Pontiff in a letter from the Secretariate of State of His Holiness. The English version has been edited by the Benedictine nuns of Stanbrook Abbey, and commended in a foreword by the Archbishop of Westminster.

It is a most timely book meeting a very real need. Many Brothers and Sisters, and no small number of pious layfolk, desirous of joining actively in the solemn liturgical prayer of the Mystical Body, recite at least parts of the Divine Office, and it will be an immense help and encouragement to them to have at their disposal an English version, that they may really understand the words in which they pray. For this purpose no better version of the Sacred Scriptures—from which nearly all the Office is drawn—could have been chosen than Monsignor Knox's, so famous for its faultless literary style and even more so for its complete intelligibility; while the English translation of the collects is taken from the O'Connell-Finberg *Missal in Latin and English*. By that curious convention that obtains in publishing circles thanks for the use of these English versions are returned, quite correctly, of course, to the publishers, and not to the men who laboured for years to produce them.

The Little Breviary keeps to the plan of the Canonical Hours except that Matins has always one nocturn only, consisting of three psalms with their antiphons and three lessons. The Office for the Dead, however, is given in its entirety. Hymns have been abridged and, for the most part, newly translated; chapters and collects are given in full. Salient points are the useful introduction, with its spiritual meaning, to each psalm, and rubrical directions for the Office said in choir.

Much credit is due to the Benedictine nuns of Stanbrook Abbey for their competent editing of the English version of this valuable book, and their excellent translation of texts other than Scriptural texts and collects. At the risk of seeming ungrateful and ungracious—without the intention of being either—may we remark that *artifex* as a title of St Joseph (the new feast of 1 May) seems to mean *workman* or *craftsman* rather than *worker*; and that *unto* is archaic and

eschewed by modern English translators of biblical and liturgical texts. *Kyrie eleison*, being an interjection, in origin the response to the invocations of a litany, is better translated as *Lord, have mercy!* When the Church wishes to say "Lord, have mercy on us" she uses "eleison hymas", as in the *Improperia* of Good Friday. And does *St Petrus ad Vincula* really mean "St Peter's Chains", or *St Maria ad Nivès* mean "our Lady of the Snow"?

The Little Breviary is a remarkable book, well worth, both in content and in its production, the rather stiff price of four guineas.

La Bible dans la Liturgie. By Charles Burgard. Pp. 195. (Casterman [Editions de Maredsous], Paris, 1958.)

"THE Church," wrote Pope Pius XII in *Mediator Dei*, "faithful to the mandate received from her Founder continues the priestly function of Jesus Christ, chiefly by the Holy Liturgy." Among the different elements that constitute the Sacred Liturgy the reading of the word of God, of sacred Scripture, which takes places in various liturgical functions, and particularly in the Mass, is certainly one of the most important. In the Liturgy of the Word the Church breaks the bread of the word of God as in the Liturgy of the Sacrament she breaks the bread of the Eucharistic Food. Numerous texts of the Bible are woven into the Mass formularies—into Introits, Graduals, Offertory and Communion antiphons—and clothed with splendid melodies, but these texts are primarily prayers and directly part of the worship of God. But other texts—the Epistle and other lessons, the Gospel—have an especial pastoral value for their purpose, being primarily catechetical and didactic, to instruct and edify. They have formed part of the Liturgy since Apostolic days, being derived from the form of the Jewish synagogue service. These readings do not merely contain the word of God, they *are* the word of God, written under the inspiration of the Spirit of Truth; and they have in the Liturgy a special manifold efficacy. The celebrating priest is not only the minister of the sacrament but also the minister of the word of God.

The liturgical movement cannot make any real headway as long as the faithful know little or nothing about Sacred Scripture. How, for example, can they possibly follow with intelligence or appreciate the value of much of each Mass formulary unless they have at least a working knowledge of the psalms, from which so much of the Church's public prayer is drawn? The restoration of the knowledge and appreciation of the Divine Word must go hand in hand with the restoration of the active participation of the people in public worship.

Fr Burgard in this valuable book (much of which appeared in the review *Cahiers Universitaires Catholiques* (1956-7) as articles for the instruction of his people of the University parish, Paris) studies the biblical texts in their liturgical setting—in the minor cycle of the seasons of Advent, Christmas and Epiphany, in the greater cycle of Easter with its long period of preparation (Septuagesima, Lent, Passiontide) and its longer period of fulfilment (Pentecost and its dependent Sundays)—considers the basis of their selection and draws from them a rich harvest of valuable information and fruitful meditation. This book should furnish much material for thoughtful study and prayer for lovers of the Church's Liturgy, and more especially for those striving to use with understanding and profit her manual of worship, the Roman Missal.

Iconographie de l'Art Chrétien. Volume II, Iconographie de la Bible (Nouveau Testament). By Louis Réau. Pp. 769. (Presses Universitaires de France, 1957. 4000 francs, unbound.)

THIS volume forms the third in Monsieur Réau's monumental work on the Iconography of Christian art. The first volume was a General Introduction;¹ the second the Iconography of the Bible, which has two parts the Iconography of the Old Testament, and that of the New (the volume under review). The work is to be completed by a book on the Iconography of the Saints.

Monsieur Réau, a member of the Institut, is a writer of great distinction with an imposing list of works on art to his credit. This third part of his great work on iconography is a remarkable book, not only for its bulk, but because of the immense amount of valuable information that it contains. The writer does his work very thoroughly; he deals in book one with the iconographic types in the East and West of our Lord and our Lady—including an interesting discussion on the alleged portraits of Christ and his symbolical representations in the art of the catacombs; and the history and veneration of his Mother, with a section on genealogical themes. In book two the events of the life of our Lord—his infancy, public life, Passion and glorification—and of the Blessed Virgin are dealt with as the inspiration of religious art. The third book deals with the Last Things—death and judgement—as the subjects of art.

In this huge volume Monsieur Réau has brought together—in a very readable, clear form—a vast amount of valuable, interesting and useful information on iconography and art. For each topic he has selected and catalogued according to their period the great

¹ Reviewed in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, September 1956.

masterpieces which it inspired and for each he adds a bibliography; and there are 48 plates reproducing great paintings. His book is an invaluable work of reference—not necessarily infallible in every detail—for those interested in the iconography of sacred art. Monsieur Réau knows quite a good deal about the Bible, Catholic theology, and even Liturgy, but unhappily, he does not know enough. He is, it appears, a Rationalist, and is, of course, entitled to his views on philosophy and religion, but why does he vitiate such a fine book by quite gratuitously dragging in all kinds of extraneous matters, of a most controversial character, which have really nothing to do with iconography and art? And if he must permeate his book, so estimable on iconography, with Rationalistic theories on the Bible—the unhistorical character of the New Testament, the alleged contradictory statements of the evangelists, and all the rest of the Rationalist paraphernalia—and with attacks on Catholic beliefs, he might at least be up-to-date in his biblical criticism and theological agnosticism. Why be so outmoded as to resurrect the hoary old fables of nineteenth-century unbelief, such as the derivation of incidents in our Lord's life or of Christian beliefs from pagan myths and folklore, which have long since been very effectively dealt with by competent biblical scholars and theologians, and have been for many a year dishonourably interred?

Monsieur Réau is quite entitled to tilt at the veneration of relics of suspect authenticity—Catholic historians do the same, while Catholic theologians condemn all forms of superstition—but he is not entitled to represent exaggerated selected instances of the devotional practices of the credulous, or the eccentricities of *dévotes*, as the doctrine or practice of the Catholic Church. In any case the works of religious art with which his book is concerned were inspired by orthodox Catholic beliefs, and it would have more than sufficed in a book on art to have given a brief, *objective* account of these beliefs, whatever Monsieur Réau may think about them, without objectionable commentary. What indeed would have inspired the masterpieces of religious art if the dreary theories of Rationalists were in fact true and derived from authentic tradition?

It is a great pity that a book so valuable to anyone interested in Christian art is so vitiated by a crop of doctrinal mistakes and rendered so suspect by tendentious assertions which have really nothing to do with the iconography of the New Testament that it cannot be recommended to Catholics, except to those who are sufficiently well instructed as to be able to separate the grains of precious truth from the chaff of harmful error,

The Mass of the Roman Rite (Missarum Sollemnia). By Rev. Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J. Translated by Rev. Francis A. Brunner, C.S.S.R. Vol. I, pp. xviii + 490; vol. II, pp. viii + 531. (Benziger—Burns Oates. £6 15s.)

The Liturgy of the Mass. By Pius Parsch. Third edition. Translated and adapted by Rev. H. E. Winstone, M.A., with an introduction by Rev. Clifford Howell, S.J. Pp. xiii + 344. (Herder (1957). 25s.)

THERE can be no sound or satisfactory knowledge of the rites of the Mass without thorough historical investigation. This twentieth century has been the great century of the historical study of the Christian Sacrifice. Previously books on the liturgy of the Mass were mainly concerned with the allegorical interpretation of its rites—which had begun in the Middle Ages—and many of them contained much of an unscientific and pseudo-pious character, or merely dealt with the rubrics of the Mass. But our age is especially an age of science and so, happily, in keeping with this, there has developed a really scientific study of the Mass rites and especially of our own Roman rite. Since the beginning of the century there has been a flood of books on the Mass, in many languages—books good, bad and indifferent—and also much valuable investigation into the history of its ceremonial has appeared in monographs and in articles in learned journals. But the greatest, undoubtedly, of all these—a book that became a classic overnight—is the now famous *Missarum Sollemnia*, a genetic study of the Roman Mass, written by Fr Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J., an Austrian, and professor of theology in the University of Innsbruck. This remarkable book is the fruit of many years of research and of active university teaching. It was begun before the war in Innsbruck, continued in Vienna after the Nazi invasion of Austria, and later from 1942—amid the hazards and difficulties of war time—in the comparatively peaceful village of Hainstetten. It was first published in Vienna in 1948.

Fr Jungmann tells us that he “wanted to build a solid structure that did not rest in conjecture and on the unexamined acceptance of the data of earlier authors”. And how wonderfully he has succeeded! In addition to an amazing amount of original research, the extent of his reading of the vast literature of the subject is simply incredible. Not even the smallest contribution in any of the leading European languages to magazines of comparative insignificance seems to have escaped his notice. Not only is there a seven-page bibliography, but almost every page of the book is equipped with innumerable references to original sources and to the comments on them of the writers of centuries.

Fr Jungmann covers the field of his enquiry with absolute thoroughness, dealing magistrally with the shape and the forms of the Roman Mass from the early centuries, and with every detail of the existing rite—this latter part alone covering nearly seven hundred pages! Most valuable, exhaustive indices complete the book—an index of sources (Christian, non-Roman and Roman liturgies) and one of “Names, Things and Formulas”.

We owe the English version of *Missarum Sollemnia* to Fr Francis A. Brunner, C.S.S.R., professor of Theology in St Joseph's College, Kirkwood, Mo. He has efficiently translated it from the German revised edition of 1949, and his translation was published in the United States in 1951. Those who do not read German owe him a great debt of gratitude. Happily the Knox version is used for citations from the New Testament, thereby assuring readers of an intelligible text. The American edition was published by Benziger Brothers and is now being distributed in Great Britain and Ireland by Burns & Oates.

The two volumes, excellently produced, cost (“tell it not in Gath”) £6 15s.—due, presumably, to its American origin and the balance of payments!—but for any serious student of the Mass of the Roman rite this book is just indispensable, cost what it does. With its 1047 pages it makes a miniature encyclopaedia of information on the rite of the Mass of incomparable value.

Fr Parsch's *Liturgy of the Mass* is quite a different type of book from Fr Jungmann's, its purpose being pastoral and—as its author writes in a foreword to the third edition—“predominantly practical, namely, that priests and educated laymen should have a deeper and livelier understanding of the Mass”. Fr Pius Parsch, an Augustinian Canon of Klosterneuburg Abbey, was himself eminently practical. He did much pastoral work in different parishes and gained considerable experience as an army chaplain during the First World War. He learned to his sorrow how little many Catholics know about the Bible or the Liturgy. He was one of the first to realize the import of the famous dictum of St Pius X that active participation in the Church's worship is “the primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit”. And so he became one of the foremost apostles of the liturgical movement among the ordinary people of a parish. Through his monthly review *Bible and Liturgy*, his pamphlets, articles and books, and in the pulpit, he laboured with immense fruit for the movement until his lamented death in 1954. He was very active, too, in urging certain liturgical reforms, and he lived long enough to see some of the results of his zeal in the diffusion of the Dialogue Mass, the Easter Vigil reform of 1951, and the introduction of an

appreciable amount of the vernacular into the Austrian and German rituals of 1935 and 1950.

The Liturgy of the Mass is an admirable book. Written against a background of much knowledge, it eschews deliberately all the trappings of erudition—numerous references to authorities, pages of footnotes and all the rest, so essential and desirable in a book written for the more learned on strictly scientific lines—and while it is brimfull of accurate and interesting information is delightfully easy to read. It is an ideal book from which to prepare a series of popular instructions on the rite of the Roman Mass. The account of the history of the origin and development of the Canon is especially well done, as clear and simple as may be—a very difficult subject, helped out by tables (pp. 204, 333) and a diagram (p. 217).

The translation has been very efficiently done from the third edition—which had the benefit of having been revised by Fr Parsch after a study of Fr Jungmann's *Missarum Sollemnia*—and brought right up to date by footnotes dealing with rubrical changes made since 1949, by Rev. H. E. Winstone. It seems a pity, however, that citations from the Bible are made in a version which uses out-moded words like "unto", "ye", "hath", "vouchsafe", and all the biblical-theological-liturgical jargon that modern translators, for clearness sake, are striving—whether rightly or wrongly—to jettison. We who do not read German thank Fr Winstone and Herder for placing this most useful book at our disposal.

Fr Clifford Howell, S.J., a great admirer of the work done by Fr Parsch for the liturgical movement, and himself a zealous worker in the cause, contributes a telling introduction.

J. B. O'C.

Aujourd'hui, L'Afrique. By Dr L. Aujoulat; published by Casterman, Tournai, Paris. 1958. Pp. 400. (A publication in the Collection *Eglise Vivante*. 120 fr.)

WITH feverish precipitancy the black races are trying to take their place in the community of nations. They are straining to overcome the vital crisis which the invasion of the European civilization has presented to them. A powerful craving for independence is vibrating through the African continent from coast to coast. A lucid exposition of the actual state of affairs is urgently desired. The author of this book is one of those few Europeans who are eminently competent to speak about it. Dr Aujoulat has known Africa now for twenty-five years, with a knowledge which penetrates to the heart of the matter. Having gone to the French Cameroons as a medical lay missionary, he made it his task to place himself at the disposal of his black brethren.

ren, sharing their hopes and disappointments. Soon he became their spokesman, and after the last war he entered the political arena as deputy of the Cameroons, was several times secretary of state in the ministry for the Colonies and was a member of the Government under Mendès-France. His numerous journeys through the length and breadth of Africa have given him a deep insight into the real situation of the African races.

Black Africa of today is no longer the country of carefree, peaceful existence, neither is it any longer the country of half-wild negroes, who have to be treated as children and to be ordered about, to be "colonized" as we liked to call it. The negro races have come to that decisive state when they want to take decisions themselves. They are not interested whether the Europeans who come to them are in favour of or against their advancement. All they ask from the white race is whether they are going to provide them with the means for a complete emancipation. No nation or people or race is willing to remain for ever dependent on others, and that is the core of the present-day problem of relationship between Black Africa and White Europe. The march towards self-government has started, the demand is repeated, is urged, is propagated by radio, by newspapers, by the tom tom. For the Black Race there is no holding back any longer of the avalanche of evolution towards freedom and equality in the international community of nations. Are they ready for it? The Africans think they are and the book of Dr Aujoulat *Aujourd'hui, L'Afrique* undertakes to prove that they are.

The book is divided into five parts, each consisting of five chapters. In the first part the writer describes the negro in his natural surroundings, his character, the social and racial properties of the black race; in the second part the invasion of the Western civilization into Africa is described and the reactions and repercussions this has had on the Africans. The third part examines the results of the clash of European and African cultures and he comes to the conclusion that, although there is an *élite* of *évolués*, the majority of the people are not ready yet for a full-scale adoption of European civilization and he very wisely suggests that the process of education be continued, but in such a way that the advantages of Christian culture can be absorbed by the people and integrated into their own culture. No wholesale substitution of one civilization by another, but gradual improvement of the backward one by the more perfect one should be the aim. The fourth part of the book is entitled: "*L'Afrique noire à l'heure de Bandoung*". In this part Dr Aujoulat considers the various French efforts to grant more independence to their colonies, which in the end have not proved successful, and he ruefully concludes that

France may have to draw the bitter conclusion from its vain efforts and give up the colonies. On examining which forces are at work to stir up this general protest among the Africans, he points first of all to Nasser, because, according to educated Africans, he is considered the liberator of the African continent. This may be the idea of some "évolués" who listen to the radio or who read newspapers, but the great multitude is more aware of two elementary truths which make them clamour for independence: their own poverty compared with the wealth of the civilized Westerns and their own under-development. The writer describes how the younger generation is prepared to accept an independence in misery and mediocrity rather than revert to the state of colonial subjection. The Bandoung Conference and the Communist activities are analysed. The awakening of Black Africa cannot be denied and they and we are placed before the choice either to admit them to international solidarity or to drive them into rebellion and Communism. When he finally considers in the fifth part the religious position, Dr Aujoulat makes it clear that now is the suitable time to establish the Church with the assistance of the native clergy and the lay apostolate.

This book of Dr Aujoulat will give a shock to many people, but it can only be a salutary shock. It will help the Africans in their difficult but hopeful march to a brighter future. Dr Aujoulat, founder of the Lay Missionary movement "Ad Lucem", is one of those Christians who have understood that the Church must make herself frankly African with the Africans. Dr Aujoulat brings us a message. May he be listened to before it is too late.

J. DE REEPER

The Great Link. A History of St George's Cathedral, Southwark. By the Right Rev. Mgr Bernard Bogan. (Burns Oates. 12s. 6d.)

THE Administrator of St George's, Southwark, has now brought up to date his lively record of the cathedral first published in 1948. This second and revised edition, in time for the proposed opening of the new cathedral on 4 July next, contains new information about the origins from a long-lost manuscript record rediscovered in 1952. There are also some additional pages covering the last days of the long and dynamic episcopate of Archbishop Amigo and the eight fruitful years of his successor. There are two Forewords, by the two bishops respectively, and thirty illustrations.

The great church standing on the spot where the Gordon Riots began in 1780 is itself the Link between the Penal Times and the Revival. But there was a living link in the person of that extraordinary man, Provost Doyle ("Fr Thomas"), who spent nearly sixty

years (1820-79) in the parish and was virtually the builder of the cathedral. By incredible exertions in appeals and begging tours he was also its sustainer. The book is thus for the most part the biography of this heroic priest, one might almost say, his autobiography, because of the revelation of his vivid personality in his astonishing letters. He wrote tirelessly, reporting, appealing, cajoling, "giving rein" (as he said) "to his elasticity" with a virtuosity in his irrepressible exuberance that strongly recalls the celebrated "Fr Prout".

The penultimate chapter contains a moving account of the last moments of Archbishop Amigo. Mass was offered at the bedside of the dying archbishop by Mgr Cowderoy in the very early morning of Saturday, 1 October 1949.

The Celebrant prayed for him at the Commemoration of the Living; the Archbishop died at the elevation of the Chalice; and the Celebrant prayed for his departed soul at the Commemoration of the Dead; a unique and blessed end for one whose priestly devotion to the Holy Mass and the Blessed Sacrament was so outstanding a feature of his life.

Principality and Polity. Aquinas and the Rise of State Theory in the West. By Thomas Gilby, O.P. (Longmans. 30s. net.)

Not long ago *Le Figaro* had the bright idea of inviting notes for a "Pantheon of Europe", a list of great names for "the Elysian fields of the spirit". In this revival of Auguste Comte's Calendar of Great Men, close behind Dante, Shakespeare, Michael Angelo and so on, came St Thomas Aquinas. Formerly a "History of the Middle Ages" might or might not mention his name or accord him a single line; now, he is explained to the *intelligentzia* in paper-backs of vast circulation. Evidently the climate of opinion is more favourable.

Fr Gilby, who has about a dozen brilliant books to his credit, is a practised exponent of Aquinas and of the whole Scholastic Philosophy. He has now followed up his impressive contribution to political theory, *Between Community and Society*, with another study in the same field. From a deep and intimate knowledge of the whole work of St Thomas he has picked out and put together all that the saint has written on politics and political theory and has arranged, interpreted and explained it. The book is, in short, a study of the early formulation of political philosophy within the conditions of mediaeval thought and the limitations of mediaeval experience.

It is not easy to be epigrammatic about the Middle Ages, but Fr Gilby, who at all times writes with great but controlled liveliness, knows how to illuminate knowledge by imagination. There is not a

page here without a glint in it and very many pages—indeed, whole sections—are sparkling. The book is deeply learned yet very lucid and very lively. Fluency and felicity of expression, rapid and racy summaries, aphorism and apt quotation make it, for all its abstract and generalized matter, extremely entertaining. The panoply of learning is enlivened by a vast range of illustration which almost everywhere extends to modern instances. He can refer you to the McNaughton Rules as well as to Matthew Paris, to Winston Churchill as well as to Walafrid Strabo. We meet with Adenauer and Bismarck as well as Alexander of Hales and St Bonaventure. He is aware of Renoir equally with Maritain.

Part I shows in four chapters the influences at work. These were: "the Theologians", i.e. the Bible and the Fathers; "the Jurists", both canonists and civilians; "Landed Men and Wanderers", a rapid and brilliant sketch of the evolving social structure from stark feudalism to the rich diversity of thirteenth-century life; and fourthly, "the Philosophers", which means Avicenna—Averroes—Aristotle. These ninety pages could be read with delight by anybody to whom political theory, as such, is remote and recondite, by a reader who remembers that different ideas of how men should live together were held not only by prelates and politicians, divines and decretalists, but also by wandering scholars, by poets and minstrels, crusaders, adventurers and even the men-at-arms.

Four main principles are then set out and expounded. First, that secular authority arises out of social needs inherent in human nature and not imposed *propter peccatum*. Second, that such authority is distinct from and not beholden to the Church; St Thomas believed in the condominium, the twin authorities in equilibrium, neither caesaro-papism nor papo-caesarism. Thirdly, temporal power concerned temporal affairs only. Fourthly, that government and legislation were functions of art rather than of ethics.

An adequate idea of the treatment could be given only by extensive quotation but a single instance must suffice. The definition of Law is:

An ordinance of reason directed to the common good, issued by the authority in charge of the political community, and promulgated to its subjects.

Thereupon, analysis and discussion of the four clauses of the definition (1) *ordo rationis*, (2) *ad bonum commune*, (3) *ab eo qui curam communitatis habet*, (4) *promulgata*, which last, by the way, disposes in advance of Boniface VIII's *omnia jura in scrinio pectoris*. So, too, we find an enumeration of the various types of law: the Eternal Law, the Natural Law, Positive Law (Divine), Positive Law (Human),

the Mosaic Old Law, the New Law of the Gospel, *Lex Fomitis*, and the newly emergent *Jus Gentium*. The search for exactitude in rendering the famous expression *politikon zōon* is rather amusing: animale sociale et politicum; animale civile; animale domesticum et civile; animale civile et conjugale.

Standing between John of Salisbury and Marsiglio of Padua in time and in opinion St Thomas would not merely by political speculation have achieved celebrity or influenced movements. He was too tranquil, impartial and aloof. Actually, his two political treatises were left unfinished. His balance and moderation rendered his work unsuitable for use as ammunition in the great institutional conflicts of his own and of the following period. He is neither of the Right nor the Left. He has no knowledge of the Emperor *as such*, still less of the Hohenstaufen. His civil ruler is always *Rex* or *Princeps*, and this ruler no semi-sacerdos, no consecrated despot but a man sub Deo et sub Lege, with duties to perform and covenants to keep with his subjects. Neither, too, is the Pope the Lord of the World to whom every baptized Christian is necessarily subject.

The arrangement of the book reflects its schematic character and provides the fullest help for the reader. There is an elaborate synopsis, a very copious index and on every page footnotes with references. The references to St Thomas are naturally detailed and precise, those to other works are very numerous and varied. They constitute in fact a bibliography of encyclopaedic range, in five or six languages. Almost all of these books are modern, very many of them quite recent, and so must enhance considerably the value of this remarkable work.

Histoire du Christianisme. Par Dom Charles Poulet. Avec le concours de plusieurs collaborateurs publiée par les soins de J. Sécher. Fascicules xxxv & xxxvi. (Beauchesne et ses Fils. Paris: Broché. By subscription.)

THE publishers' note at the end of No. 35 explains that this voluminous work has not been brought to a halt by the death in 1950 of Dom Poulet and that its continuance is undertaken by Canon J. Sécher. What was written by the late Dom Poulet comes to an end with the year 1867, when the religious history of France was marked by the Lay Education campaign of Duruy and by the emergence of Gambetta as a politician. There is an Index of Proper Names and a Table of Contents. Then, in Part No. 36, under the heading "Book VIII" we begin what is virtually a separate work with a different pagination: "The Roman Question" in five chapters and the beginning of "The Church under the Third Republic". Here

the pace is swifter, as this synoptic account of the Roman Question (in which France had from 1849 to 1870 the preponderant part) covers the hundred years from 1815 to 1915 in eighty-seven pages. The work is in general as interesting and informative as before but it remains as far as ever from fulfilling its title. The whole treatment is that of a French priest writing exclusively for French readers, as if there was no Christianity anywhere else.

Those who may not be aware of the large part played by formula and epigram in French affairs will find here enlightenment not unmixed with entertainment. There is quite a lot of verbal fireworks. Thiers' dictum about Education: "*L'État a le droit de frapper un peu la jeunesse à son effigie*" is quoted here without the qualifying words; but there is not too much bias. Thiers also objected to the Jesuits as not being French enough and as having their roots in a foreign country, whereupon Montalembert retorted that all Protestant sects had full liberty and there was no discrimination—not even against the Quakers. Montalembert's own formula: "*L'Église libre dans l'État libre*" was promptly mocked with "*l'erreur libre dans l'État libre*". Louis Veuillot, is, of course, the storm-centre of the whole epoch. He did not mind, he said, being called a barking dog for he was ready to bark at any prowler whether he wore a black or a violet cassock. The trouble with the ferocious editor of *L'Univers* was that he did nothing whatsoever to persuade the unbelievers and all he could to inflame the passions of the believers. Even Dom Poulet calls him "*l'anti-libéralisme incarné*". Another pair of duellists are Cardinal Pie and Mgr Dupanloup, Bishop of Orléans. Of these two Mgr (afterwards Cardinal) Mermillod said: "*The Bishop of Poitiers concerns himself with principles, and the Bishop of Orléans with men's minds. The former wants to bring their minds to the principles, the latter to bring the principles to their minds. But the principles won't budge.*" Long before the Vatican Council Darboy, a Gallican at large and a despot in his own diocese (Paris), is at variance with Pius IX. He writes an acrid letter to the Pope and in reply is told that he is imbued with the doctrines of Febronius. On the whole, however, the work is much more chronicle than history.

Letters from Hilaire Belloc. Selected and edited by Robert Speaight. (Hollis & Carter. 30s.)

A SHEAF of over three hundred letters written by Belloc will arouse considerable expectation and there will be no disappointment, except to those whose expectations were not according to knowledge. This collection does in fact illustrate the man very clearly, the

narrow range of his intimacy, his delight in expressing himself to the little band of chosen friends, his exuberance and play of mind and mood. The letters range in time from about 1900 to 1942, in number, to just over 300; the total number of the recipients is only thirty and ten of them get only one apiece—though among the ten are Mgr Ronald Knox, Fr Vincent McNabb, O.P., and Wilfrid Meynell; and there is strangely little to G. K. C. Nearly half the total here printed went to three persons: Mrs. Raymond Asquith, Mrs. Reginald Balfour and Maurice Baring, while eighty more went, altogether, to only five others. If, for instance, there had been more to George Wyndham or J. S. Phillimore readers might have been able to realize the enormous range of Belloc's knowledge and there would have been less repetition.

Many of the sixty-six letters to Maurice Baring are in verse; one consists entirely of five limericks. Most of the others relate his impressions and experiences (sometimes comic) of his enormous and endless journeys. A great deal of it is about religion, especially to those ladies who were, or were about to be, converts. It was not only because he was bound by ties of gratitude and affection, but because he regarded a certain group of persons as an élite and the hope for the future of the Church in this country; for the old Catholic families he had something like an antipathy, for he seems to have understood that he would not have been *their* choice as defender of the Faith.

There is very much about history here, the only set piece being a long letter in June 1917 to Fr (now Mgr) Philip Hughes about the approach to the Middle Ages. It is almost an epitome of his *Europe and the Faith*, with all his leading ideas; the present writer received a much shortened version of it in August 1919. Considering the number and character of the cities he visited, there is extremely little about the visual arts. At Orvieto it is the wine, not Luca Signorelli or Fra Angelico. The Raphael Madonna at Dresden, the sculpture in the Chapel at Brou (Bourg en Bresse), a *stèle* at Carthage, and Milan cathedral seem to be all that aroused his enthusiasm, and there are two astonishing asides about "the hideous V. and A. Museum" and "that detestable sink, Florence". At Carthage he was presented to the renowned White Father, Delattre. The venerable archaeologist thought that Belloc was the Director of the British Museum and lost interest on hearing that he was not.

There is, of course, a great deal about wine; one letter to Duff Cooper is almost a wine merchant's list. And on this subject we have the only instance of a deliberately composed epistle. Readers of *The Four Men* will remember the long purple passage (pp. 162-5)

about the marvellous ale at the Washington Inn. That letter, with Aleph, Beth, Ghimel, etc., but about a consignment of port, is here recast for Gilbert Moorhead at some date in 1914; the whole structure and substance are the same but with studied variations of phrase.

There is much that is richly comic, much that is pathetic, and no lack of pungent wit. James Gunn's portrait of himself produces: "a powerful gorilla with a grievance—which I believe is a frequent aspect". About the grievance he is quite explicit:

They could not bear the idea of an historical Fellow who would have written and taught history in a fashion clashing with their own . . . first one college then another turned me down . . . in this way I wasted the first critical years of my life. I went to London and have had to earn my living since then as best I could.

In 1928 he tells one intimate friend that he had to miss seeing Pius XI and the Ambassadors at Rome because he had no decent clothes to go therein and had holes in his boots. And again he writes in 1934:

"My chief trouble is that when I get ill I can't write and on my writing depends King's Land and the family, for I have no reserve left." That a man so gifted should be writing that, at the age of sixty-four, was indeed a tragedy, but he had been his own worst enemy.

In a useful Preface Mr Speaight gives the younger reader sufficient information about Belloc's correspondents; to the older reader the book reflects a phase that was intensely interesting but will soon be forgotten.

J. J. DWYER

Inward Peace. By Raoul Plus, S.J. Pp. ix + 131. (Burns Oates. 10s. 6d.)

IN our mechanical age noise becomes more and more unavoidable, afflicting an ever-increasing number of people with the modern disease of "nerves", outward disturbance destroying inward peace. Fr Raoul Plus, in the latest of his many works, is like a doctor opening a spiritual clinic where he offers the distraught the remedies they require, his book of reference being the Gospel which is, after all, a Gospel of Peace. He proves that peace is a state of perfect balance, a habit of seeing things in their true perspective and proportion. If this calm vision can be attained, external clamour becomes unimpor-

tant because it no longer disturbs, one having learned to live in the silence of faith, hope and love by possessing the peace Christ came to bestow upon those who seek it from Him.

Apart altogether from external disturbances, tranquillity of soul can never co-exist with pride, humility being the one foundation of the soul's abode of peace. Having illustrated his pages with numerous quotations and examples to clarify his instruction, the author produces a most convincing picture of a tormented soul whose pride made peace impossible, that of the well-known Abbess of Port-Royal, Angélique Arnauld, who remained unconverted to the end, even by a St Francis de Sales. Although a highly educated lady, she had been badly brought up, which means that her family—particularly her ambitious and intriguing father—were very largely responsible for the tragedy of her life. Her story has a pathetic interest for all who would know the meaning of true sanctity, and it makes a fitting close to *Inward Peace* because it demonstrates that no gifts, however great, can compensate for the ravages of pride.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

ET CUM SPIRITU TUO

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, June 1958, pp. 366-7)

The Rev. H. E. Winstone writes:

I was most interested in Fr J. B. O'Connell's "Reply" in the June number of THE CLERGY REVIEW, in which he takes Fr Parsch to task for his suggested rendering of the Latin: *Et cum spiritu tuo*—a reply which must be read in conjunction with his article "And with Thy Spirit", in THE CLERGY REVIEW, June 1953 (p. 344).

"No writer," he says in his earlier article, "denies that 'Et cum spiritu tuo' means 'And with you', why not say so, then, in English instead of the unintelligible Hebrew-Latin-unEnglish phrase 'And with thy spirit'?" Why not, indeed? That is a question which every translator of the Missal has to ask himself with growing perplexity. The first problem is this: Although the phrase is admittedly Hebrew, it is not merely unEnglish, it is also unLatin. Why then was it used at all in the Latin rite? The expression must have sounded strange

to Latin ears, and the early compilers of the rite must have had a reason for using it. After all, they were Latin speakers, and were trying to do for a Latin-speaking people what the English translator is trying to do for English-speakers today. Now we know that they retained other Hebrew expressions—Amen, Alleluia, *per omnia saecula saeculorum*, etc.—because these had acquired a certain Christian connotation which it was desired to retain. Might not the same be true in this case? If not, why on earth should a Latin-speaking audience be directed to greet their Latin-speaking minister in this most unLatin phrase *Et cum spiritu tuo*?

When we enquire further what that particular Christian liturgical connotation was, we find ourselves in difficulties. It is a matter on which more patient research might well be done, for it does seem that the Christian “overtones” of this formula have largely been lost sight of in the centuries that have supervened. Fr Parsch’s suggestions may be far-fetched—though I suspect that Fr O’Connell’s amusing *reductio ad absurdum* makes them seem more far-fetched than they really are. Nevertheless, there must be some good reason for the expression, and the translator, faced with the task of rendering faithfully the complete sense of the liturgical texts cannot, it seems to me, afford to overlook this fact. Mgr Knox must have realized this when he translated the phrase, not just “And with you”, but “And with you, his minister”. Botte and Mohrmann retain the phrase “et avec votre esprit” in their translation of the Ordinary of the Mass—and for the same reason (*see* p. 52, *L’Ordinaire de la Messe*, Paris & Louvain, 1953).

Have we really the authority to jettison a phrase which has been consecrated by centuries of liturgical use merely because it is un-English and we find it difficult to define its precise meaning? As translators, surely No;—not until the scholars have proved beyond reasonable doubt that there are no Christian “overtones” at all to this expression, and the compilers of the Latin rite were merely being quite arbitrarily obscurantist in using it.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

had a
were
aslator
t they
omnia
ertain
not the
Latin-
inister

litur-
matter
s seem
en lost
estions
musing
n they
the ex-
faith-
to me,
s when
d with
et avec
s—and
aris &

as been
is un-
ng? As
beyond
t all to
merely

ished for
S.W.1, in